Security Council

Sixty-fifth year

Provisional

6299th meeting

Friday, 16 April 2010, 3 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Takasu	(Japan)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Lutterotti
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Mr. Vukašinović
	Brazil	Mr. Nina
	China	Mr. Long Zhou
	France	Ms. Dumont
	Gabon	Mr. Onanga Ndiaye
	Lebanon	Mr. Assaf
	Mexico	Mr. Morales Barba
	Nigeria	Mr. Adamu
	Russian Federation	Mr. Safronkov
	Turkey	Mr. Gümrükçü
	Uganda	Mr. Mugerwa
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Harvey
	United States of America	Mr. Donegan

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Letter dated 1 April 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2010/167)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

10-31773 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting resumed at 3.05 p.m.

The President: I would like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Armenia, Bangladesh and Nepal, in which they request to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the consideration without the right to vote in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, the representatives of the aforementioned countries took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Costa Rica.

Mr. Hernández-Milian (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): It is an honour for Costa Rica to speak today, in its capacity as Chair of the Human Security Network, on behalf of Network members Austria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Greece, Ireland, Jordan, Mali, Norway, Switzerland, Thailand and Slovenia, and of South Africa as an observer.

We would like to thank you, Mr. President, and your delegation for having organized this timely debate on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, which reminds us of the importance of taking a comprehensive and integrated approach to the whole concept of peacebuilding in order to achieve greater clarity and coherence. We also welcome the presence of the various ministers here today and the statements by the Secretary-General, the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Managing Director of the World Bank.

The Human Security Network would like to take this opportunity to reflect on the achievements, existing gaps and priorities in our peacebuilding endeavours from a human security standpoint.

In recent years, we have witnessed how decisions within the United Nations system have increasingly taken the peacebuilding perspective into account. The United Nations has recognized that preventing the recurrence of conflict goes beyond the implementation of any peace agreement, and t early peacebuilding strategy is indispensal fostering development and creating con conducive to sustainable peace. The instit expression of that conviction was the establishn the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in 2005.

Reinforcing the effectiveness of our col peacebuilding efforts remains one of the g challenges to keeping the 2005 promises Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) m useful contribution to our discussions on this issu

We must continue to promote a synchroniz integrated approach to peacekeeping peacebuilding. Peacebuilding should no long considered the last stage or an exit strateg peacekeeping operations. On the co peacebuilding is now mandated in some peacek operations. The Human Security Network calls inclusion of peacebuilding activities in all oper beginning with the early stages, that is in the d and strategic planning of missions. There shoul be regular communication and ongoing coordi between the Department of Peacekeeping Oper the bodies within the peacebuilding architectu the relevant national agencies.

As stated in the Brahimi report,

> "When complex peace operations do g the field, it is the task of the oper peacekeepers to maintain a secure environment for peacebuilding, and peacebuilders' task to support the political, and economic changes that create a environment that is self-sustaining." (*S/200 para. 28*)

From a human security perspective, the Ne believes that strengthening the capacity of authorities is key to meeting the basic needs o populations.

In terms of United Nations capaciti peacebuilding, the Network believes that it is imp to strengthen the bodies that make up peacebuilding architecture, namely, the Peacebu Commission, the Peacebuilding Support Office a Peacebuilding Fund. In that regard, we look forw discussions on the issue of expanding the po

experts and civilian volunteers for rapid deployment in providing assistance in peacebuilding tasks. Those duties include security sector reform, strengthening institutions and reinforcing judicial systems — activities that depend upon good cooperation between military and civilian actors. As such, we also look forward to the recommendations of the United Nations civilian capacity review.

In order to promote peacebuilding, more technical, legal and financial assistance for the strengthening of national democratic institutions and governance needs to be provided on the basis of process-oriented and sound strategies. Political stability largely depends upon the legitimacy, credibility, integrity and transparency of those institutions, in particular in areas such as security, justice and elections.

Security sector reform is a crucial element in the stabilization and reconstruction process. In acknowledging that there is no exclusive model in place for security sector reform, we are certain that the ongoing goal of United Nations security sector reform will make a valuable contribution to supporting States and societies in developing effective, inclusive and accountable security institutions. The Human Security Network encourages the work carried out by the United Nations inter-agency Security Sector Reform Task Force as the mechanism that ensures a broad and coherent approach as part of the mandates of each of the Organization's entities. Furthermore, we support the role of the United Nations in mobilizing coordinated and comprehensive international support for national security-sector reform programmes.

Supporting the consolidation and ownership of national justice institutions is fundamental to building the capacity of States to peaceably settle disputes. That could be supported by both judicial and non-judicial transitional justice mechanisms, such as prosecutions, truth commissions, reparations for victims, institutional reform and commissions to resolve post-displacement disputes over property and land. That should be done while taking the national context into account. Mechanisms such as those could, in the end, contribute to increasing accountability and facilitating the consolidation of peace and stability.

In post-conflict societies, elections are also a central element of national ownership in rebuilding the State. When necessary, electoral assistance should be included as an important component of a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy. The United Nations has built up valuable experience in providing assistance to Member States that have requested help in facilitating a steady democratic transition. In that regard, the role and support of the international community are fundamental to ensuring an adequate peacebuilding process.

Peacebuilding processes are an opportunity to rebuild social relations. Socio-economic development models and the design of public policies should promote social stability through the protection of human rights and the participation of every individual and social group. Promoting social integration is also important for political dialogue, national reconciliation and the peaceful co-existence of communities with profound post-conflict resentments and grievances. Increased funding is required for supporting reintegration programmes for internally displaced persons and to support refugees, as well for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes for former combatants. In addition, the need for assistance to victims should be recognized.

Extreme poverty and inequality are threats to the consolidation of peace. Greater investment in short-, medium- and long-term programmes would contribute to reactivating economies and creating employment opportunities, as well as to reducing the social risk of vulnerable groups and helping them to have more confidence in the peace process. It is important to ensure an adequate programmatic response that has a human-centred approach, helps fragile Governments that face difficulties in providing access to basic services and avoids the risk of the re-emergence of chronic vulnerabilities. Areas such as health and education are of strategic importance in ensuring that peace dividends are realized as soon as possible.

The Human Security Network welcomes the work being done by the Peacebuilding Commission thorough the country-specific configurations to include women and young people in peacebuilding processes. The Network would like to highlight the need to include the gender perspective and to promote equal participation for women in peacebuilding activities while taking into account their specific interests and needs. The empowerment and participation of women and young people have been recognized as crucial elements in the success of any peacebuilding strategy, given their potential for restoring the social fabric.

Finally, we would like to highlight the work of the Peacebuilding Commission and its efforts to build and expand alliances between the United Nations system, regional and subregional organizations, international financial institutions, donors, the private sector and civil society. Those synergies will contribute to establishing a common vision in support of peacebuilding processes in a coherent, comprehensive and strategic manner. We look forward to the upcoming review of the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, which is being facilitated by the Permanent Representatives of Ireland, Mexico and South Africa. We also look forward to the important discussion on how to improve and scale up the Commission's work. That will be a valuable opportunity for assessing results, considering lessons learned and strengthening the Commission's work and its relationship with other organs and agencies of the United Nations system. We call on the Security Council to make greater use of the Peacebuilding Commission's advice in the Council's deliberations on the relevant situations.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of South Africa.

Mr. Mashabane (South Africa): Allow me to congratulate you, Mr. President, for organizing this important debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. This debate is opportune and takes place at a time when the general membership of the United Nations is seized with the review of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). In that regard, the views of Member States will be critical as we take these discussions forward.

Allow me also to welcome the presence and participation earlier today at this important meeting of the Secretary-General, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Japan, Afghanistan and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Minister of Defence of Sierra Leone and the Minister of Justice of Timor-Leste.

South Africa wishes to associate itself with the statement to be delivered by the Ambassador of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission almost five years ago by both the General Assembly and the Security Council was a step in the right direction in an effort to address the challenges of preventing countries emerging from conflict from relapsing into conflict. The critical role of peacebuilding, therefore, is both to consolidate the gains achieved as a result of the peace process and to prevent relapse into conflict.

South Africa is of the view that peacekeeping operations have an important role to play in early peacebuilding efforts and as such should create an environment conducive to establishing the foundations for sustainable development, the rule of law and good governance. Peacekeeping and peacebuilding should therefore not be viewed as linear, sequential processes. An integrated approach that incorporates early peace building activities during the start up of peacekeeping missions is required to create, maintain and sustain peace. This will ensure the early delivery of peace dividends, which is critical to sustaining and consolidating the peace process. In this regard, integrated peace missions have an important role to play in maximizing the impact of the United Nations response on the ground.

Our experience in African peace missions has shown that peace agreements alone are not sufficient to bring stability to a country and that the holding of successful elections does not on its own ensure long-term stability. Effective communication and inclusive dialogue between national actors and the civilian population are critical to building confidence in the peace process.

South Africa believes that the success of peacebuilding must be directly linked to measurable impacts and concrete deliverables on the ground. These should include the improvement of socio-economic and security conditions. As such, the priorities in the post-conflict environment should centre around four basic pillars of post conflict reconstruction: security sector reform, socio-economic development, justice and reconciliation, and good governance and inclusive participatory systems.

Peacebuilding can be successful only when it is done with the Governments concerned; it cannot be done on behalf of a Government or a country. National ownership must therefore be ensured by aligning peacebuilding activities with the national priorities of the Government concerned. This, we believe, will ensure ownership and the long-term sustainability of the process.

More often than not, countries emerging from conflict are faced with the challenge of a lack or a shortage of the resources needed for immediate reconstruction and development programmes. Ensuring

that sufficient resources are mobilized to assist these fragile States is an important investment in the long-term stability and sustainability of the peace process. The international community has been willing to contribute generously to peacekeeping efforts; it is important that this commitment also be carried into the post-conflict peacebuilding phase. The international community has to avoid putting countries emerging from conflict into the challenging position of having to graduate from a well-resourced peacekeeping operation to an under-resourced peacebuilding process.

It is very important in this regard to devise a funding mechanism that would ensure adequate and sustainable resources to countries emerging from conflict. Financial and flexible donor support is therefore critical to allowing post-conflict States to deal with the myriad challenges that confronts them. The role of the international financial institutions in recognizing the peculiar needs of post-conflict countries and in providing flexible financing can therefore not be overemphasized.

In conclusion, my delegation is of the view that the review of the Peacebuilding Commission will offer yet another opportunity for the international community, and the United Nations in particular, to reflect on these challenges and to position themselves to address peacebuilding in a more integrated and holistic manner.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Park In-Kook (Republic of Korea): At the outset, I would like to express my appreciation to Foreign Minister Okada and Ambassador Takasu of Japan, in the presidency of the Security Council, for convening this very timely open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding.

Post-conflict peacebuilding plays a crucial role for countries recovering from strife, as it aims to preserve the results achieved after hostilities have ended and to prevent the recurrence of conflicts. We established the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) five years ago so that such countries might smoothly undergo the transition from a situation of conflict to that of reconstruction and development. However, the PBC has experienced a number of difficulties in fulfilling its goals due to a lack of financial and human resources, and also as a result of the shortcomings inherent in having neither a comprehensive mandate nor an integrated modus operandi. Against this backdrop, I would like to convey some of my thoughts on the pertinent issues concerning peacebuilding.

First of all, we need to closely examine the issue of how to secure financial resources and effective budget allocation. I recently had the privilege of visited Sierra Leone as a member of the PBC to review the peacebuilding process there. During the visit, I was glad to see that substantive progress had been made in a number of areas. I was also impressed with the coordination between the country-configuration Chair, based here in New York, and the Executive Representative of the Secretary-General, fulfilling the role of a one-stop service as the United Nations figurehead in the field. However, I was quite surprised to learn that there had been no contributions to the multi-donor trust fund for Sierra Leone, other than that made by Canada. The situation is similar in other country configurations, where there are little or no trust funds available, aside from the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF). Budget allocations cannot be redirected to meet changing and evolving needs.

On a related topic, the funds available to peacebuilding are very small in comparison to the various financial resources disbursed for peacekeeping operations. Since the PBF is funded on a voluntary basis, whereas the peacekeeping budget is an integral part of the United Nations budget, the two cannot be combined or redirected from each other. Hence, we should bear in mind that the funds used for peacebuilding flow directly into the host country, thereby creating an economic benefit as well. As such, I hope that issue can be viewed in the broader perspective of comprehensive United Nations system reform.

Lastly, with regard to the relationship between peacekeeping and peacebuilding, there is a misguided and widespread conviction that the two processes ought to be pursued in a sequential approach, in which peacebuilding picks up where peacekeeping left off. However, it is obvious that peacebuilding work cannot suddenly take place in the absence of sustained peacekeeping efforts. Instead, the two processes should be pursued in a two-track parallel approach until security and the rule of law are restored to an adequate level.

For certain candidate countries that have some interest in establishing a new configuration of the PBC,

there are concerns that the initiation of the peacebuilding process will trigger or expedite the withdrawal of peacekeeping operations. To alleviate such concerns, we could look into the possibility of providing military and police training to local forces during the short- and mid-term stages of the peacebuilding process, in tandem with a prolonged phase-out of peacekeeping troops, with a view towards easing apprehensions about the process and facilitating a smooth transition.

On the issue of coherence and linkage in and among individual policy areas, I should like to point out that we need to determine and prioritize the individual policy areas themselves before we talk about issues regarding their coherence and linkage.

The mandate of the PBC needs to be further elaborated upon, so that it may provide more comprehensive and concrete guidelines. We need to flesh out what the priority areas are for peacebuilding in general and, if possible, what portion of the available resources should be allocated to each of those priority areas. One size will not fit all, so there will be a need for custom tailoring for specific countries, but we do need some sort of measuring stick to go by.

I would like to stress that we need improved coordination in the work of the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Support Office so that they can mutually reinforce one another in an effective, dynamic and synergistic manner. In that regard, I sincerely hope that a tangible outcome will be attained during the PBC review process later this year so that we can get a clearer picture of the tasks ahead of us and proceed with a concrete course of action.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Abdelaziz (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, Sir, the delegation of Egypt welcomes your efforts and those of the delegation of Japan, which holds the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. We also welcome your convening of this open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding, one of the most pertinent issues within the Council's mandate for the maintenance of international peace and security. As Chair of the Non-Aligned Movement, I would like to express my support for the statement to be delivered by the delegation of Bangladesh, coordinator of the Movement, on this very important issue.

Over the past few years, post-conflict peacebuilding has witnessed unprecedented developments, such as the General Assembly's establishment of an integrated system enabling it to play a pivotal role in the coordination of international peacebuilding efforts. In this respect, Egypt reaffirms its full commitment to support the peacebuilding efforts of the United Nations through the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the Peacebuilding Commission. The Commission's activities have gained increased importance through several years of accumulated experience. It is playing an important role in coordinating international and United Nations efforts to prevent countries from relapsing into conflict.

Peacebuilding is a multifaceted and multidimensional process. For one thing, international peace and security cannot be successfully maintained without ensuring the centrality of security sector reform in both the military and social spheres; furthermore, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration processes may not achieve their objectives unless the essential development, social and economic needs are met. In addition, ensuring sustainable peace requires an enabling environment based on comprehensive national dialogue, social justice, judicial integrity and independence, and the rule of law. These factors must go hand in hand with a comprehensive socio-economic development process based on the national strategies and priorities of countries emerging from conflict.

In this regard, we are witnessing the fading of the clear boundaries which used to define the stages of succession and overlap between conflict resolution, peacekeeping, post-conflict peacebuilding and sustainable development; that is true also of the less well defined interconnection and synchronization among those phases and the roles of the principal organs of the United Nations in dealing with them within a coordinated, mutually reinforcing and inclusive framework.

Recently, calls for the simultaneous start of peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations have increased. Egypt believes that such views merit detailed and cautious consideration and recognizes the need to comprehensively study this approach with a

view to strengthening the capacity of Governments in post-conflict countries to shoulder their responsibilities — but without undermining the flow of resources needed to support these efforts. Successful peacekeeping depends on comprehensive peace agreements to which all involved parties adhere and that enjoy wide popular support, in order to create the enabling environment needed to sustain the peace and lay the foundations for a peacebuilding process that will provide Governments with what they need to shoulder their responsibilities in the security and defence sectors. This in turn will make it easier to formulate exit strategies for peacekeeping operations in the countries concerned.

Similarly, due consideration must be given to the overlap between peacebuilding processes and the launch of sustainable development efforts in post-conflict countries. Efforts to lay the foundation for good governance, the rule of law and the application of the principles of democracy and justice in societies will not realize their full potential in communities plagued with poverty, disease, hunger and continued lack of the basic living standards as enshrined in internationally agreed development goals. Thus, it is of the utmost importance to launch a peacebuilding process in an appropriate manner and at the proper time to ensure the successful establishment of the key political, economic and social pillars needed to create an enabling environment for implementing comprehensive development strategies supported by timely, predictable and sustainable financial resources.

The building of comprehensive and sustainable peace in post-conflict countries requires our sincere commitment to several objectives. First, we should maximize the chances of success of peacebuilding efforts through an unconditional and total commitment to the principle of national ownership by post-conflict countries of their national peacebuilding strategies, in which the national authorities are fully responsible for defining, planning and implementing peacebuilding strategies, with the support of the Peacebuilding Commission and in accordance with clear and objective national political, economic, social and development priorities defined without any external pressure.

Second, we should ensure that the Peacebuilding Commission continues to effectively provide advice and proposals, based on in-depth studies and in coordination with all influential actors, with a view to formulating and implementing comprehensive integrated peacebuilding strategies that lay the foundation for sustainable development in countries emerging from conflict.

Third, we should build on the accumulated multidimensional experiences of the United Nations system in the field of peacebuilding through the development of clear, defined, balanced, synchronized and equal relations among the Peacebuilding Commission, the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, with full respect for their mandates as defined by the Charter.

Fourth, we should ensure that the Peacebuilding Commission is actively involved at the early stages of peacebuilding processes, which can coincide with peacekeeping operations, and that it cooperates fully with national stakeholders to create an enabling environment and incentives to launch a comprehensive peacebuilding process within the country concerned.

Fifth, we should ensure a genuine international political commitment to peacebuilding processes and provide the needed civilian capacities, technical capabilities, financial resources and best practices, through the Peacebuilding Commission, to support these processes.

Sixth, we should maximize benefits from available capacities of the United Nations, the international financial institutions and donor countries to support peacebuilding efforts. In that regard, it is imperative to establish a monitoring, evaluation and follow-up mechanism to ensure the implementation of all national and international commitments made within the framework of nationally agreed peacebuilding priorities.

Seventh, and finally, we should ensure that the priorities of international funding mechanisms, including the Peacebuilding Fund, are consistent with the national peacebuilding priorities of the countries concerned. We must consider innovative methods to bolster the resources of such mechanisms, in particular through the Peacebuilding Fund, so that these resources can be the cornerstone of the funding of peacebuilding strategies.

The President: I now call on the representative of Guatemala.

Mr. Briz Gutiérrez (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): We are grateful to you, Mr. President, for having convened this meeting on peacebuilding, as well as for having prepared the concept paper circulated on 1 April (see S/2010/167).

We would also like to thank the Ministers from Afghanistan, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste and the representative of the World Bank for their participation.

As is well known, after an internal conflict of over four decades, Guatemala signed its peace agreements in December 1996. The process that led to that act and, in particular, the subsequent peacebuilding process, has left us with many lessons, some of which we would like to share in the context of the questions raised in the concept paper. Unfortunately, in a five-minute statement, only some general concepts can be formulated, which, though they may not sound like anything new, do contain important observations. I will mention eight points.

The first thing is that every peacebuilding process is unique and that in this area, as in so many others, there is no universally valid formula. We are often asked if our own experience is transferable to other countries. Rather than respond with a clear yes or no, we tend to say that it depends on the specific circumstances of each country and each situation.

The second point that stands out for us is the cardinal importance of domestic actors — former parties to a conflict and civil society — having a sense of ownership of the process. Not only is this logical, but, in the absence of a sense of ownership, it would be difficult to build productive relationships between domestic actors and international cooperation entities.

Thirdly, if there is a sense of ownership and functioning national institutions, the country will be paradoxically better prepared to tolerate a higher level of participation on the part of the international community in the decision-making process. Guatemala serves as an example of this. The United Nations played a fundamental role in every step involved in the winning and building of peace, but it carried out this role at the request of the domestic parties and not as an external actor with its own agenda. Thus, many viewed the Organization as another stakeholder in the peace process, and not as an extraneous presence.

This leads me to our fourth point, which is the crucial importance of international cooperation in peacebuilding processes. Without a doubt, during the first years of implementation of the commitments contained in our own peace accords, external financing acted as a catalyst for many projects, programmes and policies that would have been hard to carry out without such support. Guatemala underlines the importance of avoiding what the concept paper (S/2010/167) calls the "peacebuilding gaps" between security and economic recovery.

The fifth point is that peacebuilding must necessarily address those sources of tension that led to conflict in the first place, be they due to ideological polarization, different historical grievances or serious economic and social disparities. At least in our case, the peace accords can be interpreted as a sort of road map that enabled the peacebuilding process to tackle head-on the main sources of tension that fueled the conflict. The very titles of the various accords illustrate the point — including, in particular, the Human Rights Accord, and the Accords on the Identity and Rights of Indigenous Peoples, on Socioeconomic and Agrarian Issues, and on the Strengthening of Civilian Power and the Role of the Army in a Democratic Society.

A sixth lesson to be drawn from our experience is that peacebuilding is by definition a holistic process. Multiple and diverse commitments must be addressed simultaneously, and not in an isolated or sequential way. This, too, makes clear the enormous complexity of moving forward with such a process.

Seventh, it takes a long time to reverse a number of aspects of the conflict that existed prior to the peacebuilding process, since they have become entrenched in attitudes and modes of behaviour. For example, Guatemala still suffers, to this day from the culture of impunity that was born in the shadow of the internal conflict and now shelters delinquent activities. We therefore turned once again to the United Nations, devising an innovative arrangement to strengthen the rule of law in the form of the International Commission against Impunity in Guatemala. My main point is that, 16 years after our internal conflict came to an end, we continue to suffer its consequences.

Eighth and last, just as the concept paper has identified a gap between security and economic recovery, peacebuilding is often accompanied by a gap in expectations. At least in our case, logically, the

peace accords did not resolve all the age-old and structural problems facing our society, but we continue to strive to close that gap.

That concludes the essence of the experience that we wished to share with the Council today.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Peru.

Mr. Gutiérrez (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): Peru associates itself with the statement to be delivered by the permanent representative of Bangladesh in his capacity as the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) coordinator for the Non-Aligned Movement. In addition, my delegation should like briefly to address a number of issues that we believe to be relevant to the matter that brings us together today.

The convening of this Security Council debate on post-conflict peacebuilding at a time when we are immersed in the review of the Peacebuilding Commission gives us the opportunity to emphasize the importance of making substantive progress in that process. We hope that the process will result in agreement on the provision of sufficient means and capacities to enable the PBC to fully carry out its advisory role to both the General Assembly and Security Council, and to work more effectively in adopting comprehensive peacebuilding strategies that promote security, development and governance, in close coordination with all the agencies of the United Nations system.

A specific goal should be to enable the PBC, equipped with the necessary means and human resources, to fulfil its advisory role while consistently and coherently articulating cooperation policies aimed at strengthening peace processes in countries emerging from conflict.

A quick review of history will show that a number of countries that emerged from situations of conflict relapsed into violence or that they lacked the capacity to stay on the path to sustainable socio-economic development and were thus vulnerable to the latent possibility of renewed conflict. This is further confirmation that priority should be given to the link that exists between the concept of security, on the one hand, and social inclusion, the fight against poverty, the strengthening of institutions and the promotion of human rights, on the other. All of these components are integral to the timely re-establishment of peace.

When we speak of peacebuilding, we think of existing conflict situations that, because of their long-standing nature, generate a perverse dynamic of violence and destruction. In order to counter this trend, it is essential to build the social fabric of the country, generate political awareness, implement measures that favour inclusion and convince the private sector of the important role it has to play in the process of reconstructing its country, together with the other national institutions. Furthermore, the principal of national ownership is the main foundation upon which the entire peacebuilding process should be built. On this point, I should like to reiterate that the commitment and participation of the private sector are key to ensuring the economic recovery of a country emerging from conflict.

We have already mentioned the intrinsic relationship between security and development. Trade and business can flourish only in an atmosphere of peace and stability. At the same time, however, peace requires significant flows of trade and investment that generate employment in order to combat pockets of poverty and establish a framework for sustainable development, which is an effective component for neutralizing the threat of violence.

In this context, it is essential, in economic and development terms, that the PBC, in coordination with the international financial institutions and regional organizations, be able to continue carrying out medium- and long-term follow-up to establish the conditions needed to attract private investment and ensure the effective channeling of cooperation flows through effective accountability mechanisms.

In securing and consolidating peace in nations embroiled in conflict, we do not always follow the logical chain of first establishing security and stability, then maintaining peace and, after that, setting up comprehensive development plans aimed at consolidating that peace. Historically, experience has shown us that there is an increasing need to include early peacebuilding activities in the implementation of peacekeeping processes. In this regard, it is vitally important that, in the implementation of such measures, the PBC can play a relevant advisory role in planning those efforts, in close coordination with the other relevant United Nations bodies that are directly responsible for economic and social development, such as the Economic and Social Council.

At the same time, bearing in mind the role of the peacebuilding architecture in consolidating peace, Peru believes that it is not viable to keep the work of the PBC and the Peacebuilding Fund on separate tracks. On the contrary, there must be close interaction between them. The Commission must play a relevant role in the formulation of resource allocation policies for specific areas. Given the follow-up role played by the PBC in peacebuilding processes, it is time for us to consider creating a mechanism that would provide for synergies and feedback between the Commission and the Fund, bodies that share one common goal and value: promoting and building peace.

All Members of the Organization have a shared responsibility to strengthen the United Nations system in order to maintain, preserve and build peace worldwide. Today we have an opportunity to bring this important goal closer by taking concrete steps to strengthen the capacity of the Peacebuilding Commission to fully and faithfully carry out the role entrusted to it.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan.

Mr. Haroon (Pakistan): My delegation would like to thank you, Mr. President, for your participation in today's open debate and for the important statement of your Foreign Minister. We would also like to express our appreciation for your usual and very able stewardship of the Security Council.

In our view, conflict prevention and peacebuilding remain the greatest challenges facing the United Nations today. While peacebuilding is an essential component of conflict management that entails parallel and coordinated efforts on the security, political, humanitarian and development fronts, time has shown that it remains a complex undertaking, requiring further and closer review of ground realities and expectations, as well as continued extensive consultations. The inputs thus gathered needs to be factored into our collective action to forge a coherent, efficient and predictable response to the peacebuilding needs of countries emerging from conflict.

As pointed out by some speakers, the task of peacebuilding is further complicated by the proven risks of relapse into conflict. It is therefore very important for the international community to pay special attention to the stresses and strains on the system, particularly in the immediate aftermath of conflict — a period normally marked by challenges and opportunities alike. The challenges of a relapse into conflict can be tackled by undertaking more coordinated assessment and planning for peacebuilding and peacekeeping activities, in which both processes must be explicitly defined and clearly identified to ensure a coherent approach to a sustainable peace.

We must learn to recognize that peacekeeping and peacebuilding are each specialized disciplines, though with cross-cutting themes. These disciplines can work together by exploring pragmatic avenues of partnership through a dynamic interplay between the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the international financial institutions, the troop-contributing countries and the relevant departments of the Secretariat. As experience has shown, regrettably, this does not necessarily happen.

Early conflict management also offers some unique opportunities. There are the aspirations of the people affected by the conflict, who are determined to seize the opportunity of peace and to turn a new page for a better future. We must learn to build upon these aspirations by giving them full ownership of the process through active engagement in decision-making and investment in national capacity-building. At the same time, the international community rightly expects the local actors to inculcate the required sense of responsibility and values of governance that correspond to the ownership, and to infuse confidence among the partners.

We understand that there is no silver bullet that can precipitate conditions conducive to implementing peacebuilding strategies. Such conditions — security and political stability — can be attained only if the aim of the collective peacebuilding endeavour is to win peace and not to earn or impose it. Building such peace would require the right prioritization of the targeted areas of development, while tapping and harnessing the civilian capacities available locally before resorting to regional or international expertise. Similarly, some level of understanding of local sensitivities and a degree of flexibility in imposing conditionalities are also essential. Further progress on democracy, gender issues and human rights can only be incremental. Undue emphasis on these issues, especially in the early recovery phase, would remain counterproductive.

Sustained peacebuilding efforts also require predictable and sustained funding and the allocation of

adequate resources. This requires the cooperation and support of Member States, particularly the donors, as well as enhanced collaboration with the international financial institutions, which need to show more operational ingenuity in their assistance programmes. From the point of view of enhancing national ownership and capacity, it is also important that most of the funding be provided through Government channels. In the context of resource allocations, the steady portfolio growth in the Peacebuilding Fund is indeed gratifying, and the efficiency of the Fund will only increase with more transparency.

Pakistan is committed to the objectives of United Nations peacebuilding. As the largest troop-contributing country, we are cognizant of the importance of this endeavour. We were among the pioneers of the concept of a dedicated United Nations institutional mechanism for peacebuilding. The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) is an embodiment of that idea.

The PBC, with its unique composition and specific mandate, holds a pivotal role in the peacebuilding architecture. We are happy to note that the PBC has made steady progress in the first five years of its existence. For this, the role of the Chair, previous Chairs, and the Chairs of the various country-specific configurations, is definitely commendable. As Member States review the peacebuilding architecture this year, it is important to note that the objectives of peacebuilding will be advanced by utilizing the full potential of the PBC, as outlined in General Assembly resolution 60/180, and also by aligning its functions with lessons we should have learned thus far.

For effective response in the immediate aftermath of conflict, it would make more sense if the PBC were engaged from the outset of United Nations involvement, particularly where integrated peacekeeping missions are deployed. This would only facilitate more cohesion between the objectives of peacebuilding and peacekeeping.

I will conclude by urging a more sustained focus of the Member States on peacebuilding. In this regard, our delegation greatly values your presence in the Council, Sir, as well as Japan's active engagement over time in peacekeeping and peacebuilding processes.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of New Zealand.

Ms. Graham (New Zealand): Peacebuilding is one of the most complex and important challenges we collectively face. Its effectiveness helps to determine whether post-conflict societies achieve sustainable peace and development or descend once again into bloody conflict. It also strongly influences prospects for preserving and building upon the gains achieved through the considerable investments made in post-conflict countries by the international community. With peacebuilding tasks increasingly forming an important and sometimes central element of Council-mandated missions, it is important that there be a shared understanding of what is required for their effective implementation and that lessons learned be applied system-wide.

New Zealand has been a key contributor to numerous peacebuilding operations, including United Nations missions in Timor-Leste and United Nations-mandated operations in Bougainville, Afghanistan and Solomon Islands. We have also provided significant bilateral peacebuilding assistance within our region and beyond. Our experiences have taught us much about both the very real impact such programmes can make on the ground and the practical challenges in their effective implementation. Our views on this topic are set out more fully in the written statement we have distributed, and I will focus my comments on a number of key messages we would like to convey to the Council, based on our peacekeeping experiences.

First, while the crucial importance of meaningful national leadership, ownership and engagement, and of the need for this to inform every stage of planning and implementation are widely acknowledged, all too often this awareness is not adequately reflected in practice. Early attention to mechanisms for building and sustaining national ownership is essential.

The partnership framework agreed last year between the Solomon Islands Government and the Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands (RAMSI) is one example of how this can be achieved in practice. In addition to facilitating national ownership and aligning national and mission priorities and expectations, it has provided a mechanism for establishing agreed benchmarks for monitoring progress. Moreover, it is also a living document that can be adjusted to meet changing circumstances.

Secondly, national capacity-development lies at the heart of peacebuilding and must be a central

consideration in the formulation and implementation of peacebuilding mandates from day one. To be effective, capacity-building programmes must be based on coherent strategies developed in cooperation with local partners. These strategies should be drawn from robust needs assessments to ensure that they are guided both by realities and by requirements on the ground and that they can effectively identify and further develop existing national capacities, rather than automatically substitute international personnel.

These issues must be fully addressed before significant investments are made in capacity-building activities with long-term implications. The availability of effective analytical tools has the potential to assist with this. We welcome in this regard the Secretariat's current efforts to develop a more strategic approach to identifying, prioritizing and sequencing critical early peacebuilding tasks.

Thirdly, national capacity-building requires specialized skills and experiences beyond those required for traditional peacekeeping operations. But it is clear that our current ability to identify, recruit and deploy sufficient numbers of personnel who possess these skills is inadequate. The completion of the review currently under way of civilian personnel required for peacebuilding operations is therefore a priority of the utmost importance. We hope the review will also include suggestions on how to achieve appropriate balance between the technical knowledge and development expertise required for effective peacebuilders.

Given the central importance of rule of law capacities in many post-conflict situations, New Zealand supports in principle the Secretary-General's call for enhanced police standing capacity and the establishment of a limited standing capacity for justice and corrections expertise, provided they are based on a clear needs assessment and undertaken in the context of a broader framework for generating civilian capacities.

We also hope that the review will consider the full range of other possible options for sourcing civilian expertise, including better use of United Nations Volunteers, standby arrangements, regional pools of expertise and, potentially, partnerships with the private sector. We will also look to the Secretary-General's proposed staff mobility policy to provide options for better leveraging existing peacebuilding expertise from within the United Nations system when it is presented to the Fifth Committee later this year.

Fourthly, effective leadership is a potentially decisive factor in the success of peacebuilding operations. We welcome the steps taken by the Secretariat to enhance the selection and preparation of appropriately skilled, experienced and balanced leadership teams and to provide these teams with sufficient in-country support. These efforts must be intensified.

Finally, effective coordination and synergies among the broad range of actors on the ground are essential to preventing gaps or duplication of effort and to providing an environment with the agility to respond effectively to crises and to rapidly changing circumstances.

New Zealand welcomes improvements made to the coordination of humanitarian response in recent years as a result of the introduction of the cluster approach. Likewise, the strengthening of United Nations efforts to deliver as one is also important throughout the life of a peacebuilding mission to enable the most efficient and effective application of peacebuilding resources across the United Nations system.

Providing missions with coordinated and coherent support is also important. New Zealand has welcomed the recent steps to implement more integrated planning and operational management processes at United Nations Headquarters, and we encourage the Secretariat to keep this work under continuous review.

New Zealand is proud of its contribution to peacebuilding operations to date, but we are also very aware of the complex challenges such missions pose and of how much we and the international community have yet to learn about how best to tackle these in practice. I hope that today's open debate can take us another step closer towards such an understanding.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Kenya.

Mr. Muita (Kenya): I thank you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to share my thoughts on this very important debate. We view this debate as being most timely, given the current review of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). It is our hope that the

deliberations in the Council today will serve to enrich this ongoing process.

The Secretary-General, in his 2009 report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304), notes that threats to peace are often more imminent in the earliest post-conflict stages. It is this crucial period that offers us a window of opportunity to build lasting foundations for durable peace. It is therefore imperative that peacebuilding commence at the very outset of the cessation of hostilities. Thereafter, peacebuilding efforts must be nurtured and sustained until stability is re-established.

It was with great foresight that the 2005 World Summit decided to establish the PBC to fill the peacebuilding gaps in United Nations efforts to consolidate peace in countries coming out of conflict. Countries emerging from conflict are fragile and could easily slide back into war after the Blue Helmets depart. They need to be helped to build sustainable peace through security, development and human rights being integrated into a single coherent approach to help close gaps inherent in such situations. That also calls for the marshalling of the resources required to target those national capacities that offer the best chance of making peace irreversible and those that address the root causes of conflict.

Kenya recognizes the pivotal role that the PBC has been playing in consolidating peace in countries emerging from conflict situations. We have witnessed first-hand the PBC's engagement in several such situations on our continent, for example, in Burundi, Sierra Leone, Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic. However, we must help the PBC to better deliver its mandate to the affected countries. In that regard, my delegation believes that the PBC should come into the picture at a very early stage in the peacebuilding process. There is equally the need for the PBC to work very closely with national and regional actors in peace consolidation efforts.

To ensure that countries emerging from conflict do not relapse into chaos, peacebuilding strategies must dedicate a larger portion of their work to promoting sustainable economic development, strengthening institutions of governance and maintaining democratic norms while involving women in the process. Equally important in peace consolidation is the principle of national ownership. It is imperative that countries on the PBC's agenda identify with those objectives and feel that they own the peacebuilding process for sustained and meaningful peace to be established.

The potential inherent in the PBC as an advisory body of the General Assembly and the Security Council should be fully utilized. The ongoing review should therefore define how the PBC can create a positive synergy in order to consolidate the efforts of all partners. The United Nations agencies, the private sector and civil society organizations can all complement the PBC's efforts to ensure a successful peacebuilding strategy.

Kenya, as a member of the PBC's Burundi configuration, would like to emphasize the importance of economic recovery, socio-economic integration and the development dimension in any peacebuilding process. From that perspective, my delegation would like to emphasize the need to anchor peacebuilding gains to regional integration initiatives. It is important to assist countries emerging from conflict in integrating their economies in the wider benefits accruing from regionalization. In the case of Burundi, my delegation reiterates its support to help the country nurture its fledgling peace by enhancing its greater economic development through mutually beneficial membership in the East African Community.

To conclude, let me once again reaffirm Kenya's full support and commitment to ensuring that the Peacebuilding Commission is better adapted and suited to fulfilling its mandate in order to ensure sustainable peace and development are attained in those countries emerging from post-conflict situations.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Canada.

Mr. McNee (Canada): Let me congratulate you, Mr. President, and Japan for organizing this timely and important debate.

Peacebuilding is rightly emerging as one of the central challenges facing the United Nations. Conflicts can erode State capacity, unravel the fabric of society and hinder economic development. They also undermine regional stability and create ungoverned spaces within which armed groups and organized crime can flourish. Far too frequently, countries emerge from violence only to return to conflict within a short period and at tremendous cost. As the Security Council considers this question, it is important to analyse the

record so far. In that respect, there is much to be learned from the international engagement in Afghanistan, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste. Canada has supported peace consolidation in all three countries.

In Afghanistan, Canada's approach marshals civilian and military contributions behind a single comprehensive strategy that aligns Canadian support with the priorities of the Government of Afghanistan. As a result, Canada has focused on six mutually reinforcing priorities: enabling the Afghan National Security Forces to sustain a more secure environment; strengthening Afghan capacity to deliver basic services; providing humanitarian aid; facilitating cross-border dialogue with Pakistan; enhancing capacity for democratic governance; and, finally, facilitating Afghan-led political reconciliation.

In addition, Canada strongly supports the international community's renewed commitment to supporting the transition to full Afghan leadership of security issues, as agreed during the London Conference in January. While the context of each post-conflict country differs, in our view the underlying principles behind that approach are an important step forward and should be applied more widely.

Canada is also honoured to chair the Sierra Leone configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). As a success story for multilateral peacebuilding, Sierra Leone's experience highlights several important factors. First, strong national leadership has enabled political reconciliation and set the stage for several rounds of successful elections, thereby cementing democratic governance and rebuilding trust. Similarly, efforts to combat corruption, decentralize Government and provide essential services are helping to provide Sierra Leoneans with a tangible peace dividend.

Secondly, Sierra Leone's success has been accomplished with steady international support. Strong international military commitment, including a sizeable United Nations peacekeeping force, helped stabilize the country and end the civil war. Considerable budget support and a comprehensive security sector reform programme in the years immediately following the conflict laid solid foundations for further progress. Since 2007, the Peacebuilding Commission has also worked to ensure that Sierra Leone has the international attention and political support needed to complete the peacebuilding process.

Thirdly, the approach to peacebuilding in Sierra Leone is a model worth replicating. The international community has aligned its efforts with the priorities outlined in the Agenda for Change and Sierra Leone's own national strategy for peace consolidation and economic development. In that context, the United Nations family has also united its various mandates and resources under a common strategy, the United Nations Joint Vision for Sierra Leone. The Sierra Leone configuration of the PBC has not only endorsed that approach, but also actively oriented its work according to national priorities. Such steps have emphasized national leadership, reduced duplication, eliminated unnecessary administrative burdens and strengthened coordination.

Finally, it is worth noting that the outstanding peacebuilding issues in Sierra Leone are representative of challenges elsewhere. A large unemployed youth population represents a latent risk of instability. While a longer-term solution depends on economic growth and private sector investment, immediate action is needed to ensure that the youth contribute to peace consolidation instead of being used by political or criminal actors for violent purposes.

Canada has also provided support to peacebuilding in Timor-Leste. From 2006 until early this year, Canada contributed police experts to the United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste through the Canadian Police Arrangement, helping to increase stability and further professionalize the national police force. Since 2008, Timor-Leste has also been a member of Canada's Military Training and Cooperation Programme, which provides capacity-building through military and language training. In Timor-Leste, as elsewhere, the international community also learned a vital lesson. Successful peacebuilding requires sustained commitment.

(*spoke in French*)

Much remains to be done but several overarching principles are emerging. It is clear that peacebuilding should start as early as possible, that it is complementary to peacekeeping, and that it requires considerable resources and sustained commitment. The Security Council should continue to ensure that the core risks of relapse into conflict in a given context are identified and addressed in a targeted manner, including through closer cooperation with the Peacebuilding Commission.

Similarly, international support must be more comprehensive, better integrated and more sensitive to local context. Enhanced coordination among security, humanitarian and development actors is also essential, including between the United Nations and the World Bank, as well as with respect to the promising work of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development on principles and modalities for engagement in post-conflict States. Fully implementing the recommendations in the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding (S/2009/304) is one key component in achieving these objectives.

Finally, peacebuilding must above all strengthen national ownership. The international community should work to establish capacity for effective governance and align support behind national priorities as quickly as possible. By drawing on local, regional and international expertise, the international community also can and should do a better job mobilizing the civilian expertise necessary to support national authorities, including through enhanced South-South cooperation. Canada awaits with interest the completion of the Secretariat's study on civilian capacity within the United Nations system.

As a country strongly committed to peacebuilding, Canada is contributing to progress in each of these areas and will continue to do so in the future.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Croatia.

Mr. Vilović (Croatia): Croatia attaches great importance to this timely and relevant debate, the relevance and importance of which are undoubtedly confirmed by the high level of participation in this gathering.

Croatia has aligned itself with the statement to be delivered by the delegation of the European Union on behalf of the Union. However, let me take this opportunity to share a few additional remarks on this important topic.

The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) was established with the main aim of filling peacebuilding gaps between security and reconstruction through innovative yet coordinated, coherent and integrated approaches directed at post-conflict recovery, reconstruction and institution-building. In that regard, the PBC's primary task of supporting countries emerging from conflict was conceived as one bringing together all relevant actors, marshalling the requisite resources and providing strategic and concrete recommendations in order to improve the coordination of those efforts within and outside the United Nations.

Croatia strongly believes that effective implementation of the PBC's mandate by all stakeholders offers the best way to achieve the three United Nations pillars — security, development and the protection of human rights — all of which are indispensable prerequisites for sustainable peace and long-term stability.

Post-conflict peacebuilding, a phase that should follow the cessation of hostilities, is, in our opinion, just as important as bringing a conflict to an end. In order to prevent the recurrence of conflict, a strong nexus between peacekeeping and peacebuilding should be established as soon as possible, based on a coordinated, coherent, integrated approach, the prompt implementation of a peace agreement and in-depth knowledge of the situation on the ground.

In that regard, Croatia would like to stress the important and supportive role played by the Peacebuilding Support Office in drawing up peacebuilding strategies, as well as the valuable contributions of the PBC through its useful and innovative working methods, making use of country-specific configurations and meetings, which have brought new and thought-provoking dimensions to the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

On the basis of its own national experience regarding one of the most successful United Nations peacekeeping missions, the United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium, which contained significant elements of peacebuilding, including demilitarization, reconciliation and institution-building, Croatia supports the Council's intention to further strengthen coherence between peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding in its work. In particular, we view the Council's practice of transforming some former peacekeeping missions into integrated peacebuilding missions as an important step in the right direction towards assisting the PBC in implementing the respective integrated strategic frameworks. Therefore, cooperation between the Council and the PBC in that regard is of utmost importance. However, we still see

room for further improvement. In particular, we should consider the insight that the PBC could bring to Council deliberations regarding specific issues on countries that are on the agendas of both the Security Council and the PBC.

Efforts to date by the PBC to simultaneously address key security, political and social issues through the development of integrated peacebuilding strategies, as witnessed in all four countries on the PBC's agenda, have been extremely important. They have clearly demonstrated that the correlation and synergy among these areas are elements necessary for successful peacebuilding. Furthermore, we believe that a single national strategy instrument encompassing all relevant peacebuilding programmes and activities is a useful innovation deserving further thorough consideration.

Equally, the United Nations, for its part, should follow suit by unifying its own programmes and activities so as to ensure it delivers as one. At the same time, we should not overlook the lessons learned from the country-specific approach: that, while some commonality exists, no one size fits all and that each and every country situation should be thoroughly discussed and acted upon according to its own merits and needs.

In all these efforts, national ownership of the peacebuilding process is of paramount importance. Peacebuilding should not evolve in a vacuum for its own sake, but should build upon available domestic resources and expertise, which introduces a unique perspective otherwise not available to outsiders. This approach allows for the appropriate development and consolidation of necessary national governing structures and policies that are in line with national priorities. This, in turn, opens the way for greater acceptance of a peacebuilding mission by the local population.

In that context, Croatia strongly supports the idea of developing a pool of civilian expertise drawn primarily from regional resources, which would significantly improve delivery by shortening the preparation period and enable immediate deployment of post-conflict stabilization teams. Moreover, Croatia recognizes that the strengthening of civil society is of particular importance in peacebuilding, where non-governmental and civil society organizations may be able to provide a valuable link between the PBC and the strategy endorsed by the local population.

In underscoring the increasing regional dimension of contemporary conflicts, we would encourage further engagement and a deepening of cooperation between the PBC and regional and subregional organizations. A variety of United Nations entities active in particular regions should also be part of the equation.

It is clear that peacebuilding requires a multidimensional approach supported by timely, sustainable, predictable and flexible resources. As a co-founder of the Peacebuilding Fund, Croatia fully recognizes the critical role that peacebuilding funding plays as an early investment towards sustainable peace and development. In this regard, we note with appreciation the special roles that the Fund and the international financial institutions have been playing in peacebuilding efforts. Furthermore, Croatia welcomes efforts by the PBC to engage non-traditional donors and partners in financing its activities, as well as its attempts to ensure that national peacebuilding obligations are fully matched with fulfilled promises by the international community.

Croatia believes that, five years after its establishment, the PBC is now ready to take on further specific situations and add more countries to its agenda. At the same time, we strongly support the PBC's efforts to develop assessment tools to monitor and measure the progress achieved in the implementation of peacebuilding strategies and related activities.

In conclusion, we express our hope that the outcome of this debate will provide an important input to the 2010 review process of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture currently under way, while fully respecting the mandates of the different bodies involved in this issue.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Mr. Quinlan (Australia): It is an especially encouraging moment for Australia to speak today before the Council under Japan's presidency, and you, Mr. President, are to be commended for convening today's debate.

There is a lot of discussion, as we know, currently under way in different forums about the importance of peacebuilding. It is essential that that discussion also continue in the Security Council, since peacebuilding

is a necessary — and often the most difficult — element in preventing future conflict and in consolidating the gains achieved by peacekeeping missions. Both of these tasks, of course, are central aims of the Council's work.

I would like to focus today on only a few overarching points that have been borne out of Australia's engagement in addressing current peacebuilding challenges in Timor-Leste, Afghanistan, Solomon Islands, earlier in Bougainville, and more recently through our engagement with Sierra Leone through the work of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). We are contributing further to this debate through the current review of the PBC.

First, we think that peacebuilding needs to be considered at the inception of a peacekeeping mission. There is increasing international recognition that beginning recovery efforts as early as possible in post-conflict situations is critical to helping countries stabilize and provide essential services to their population. As such, the planning of peacekeeping missions should not be seen, of course, as a military task alone, but rather as one that demands a multifaceted effort that combines political, humanitarian and development considerations with the security dimension. This also demands a closer and more organic relationship between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission throughout the Council's consideration of a situation.

Secondly, there are of course no quick fixes to intractable problems. The transition from post-conflict to what we might call normal, while unique in each case, typically takes a long time. There is an imperative to balance the need for rapid and flexible responses to short-term issues against our steady efforts on longer-term goals. Scaling back our engagement too quickly can result in relapse into conflict. Australia learned this lesson the hard way in Timor-Leste, most obviously with the need in 2006 to return peacekeepers who had been withdrawn too quickly. We need to be cognizant of and able to respond to the rapidly changing political and security context and, of course, be prepared to see a challenge through to its conclusion.

Thirdly, while creating and sustaining peace and security is a critical component of peacebuilding, it also requires efforts at State-building. This requires all international actors — whether political, security, humanitarian or development — to develop a shared understanding of all the factors affecting a nation's ability to build a sustainable peace. They need to align their respective efforts with Government priorities and harmonize their activities to get the best results. Australia's long-term approach to helping post-conflict countries aims to address security, development, economic and political issues in this kind of comprehensive and sequenced way.

In Timor-Leste, the United Nations Mission and the Australian-led International Stabilization Force are not only helping to create and sustain peace and security, but moreover significantly providing Timor-Leste with the space to develop its Government and security institutions so that there will not in the future be any need for such an international security presence. They are also providing the space for economic and social development and investment in human resources, both of which will be decisive for the long-term future of Timor-Leste.

Australia's efforts in Timor-Leste in the earliest stages placed priority, obviously, on stabilizing the security situation, responding to humanitarian needs and helping the new Government to start immediately to rebuild the institutions it needed to govern. However, with the benefit of hindsight, we now recognize that a much earlier transition to also ensuring visible, tangible benefits to the poor living in the countryside and the very large numbers of people without jobs throughout all of Timor-Leste was desperately needed. Our new country strategy seeks to correct this imbalance, placing most emphasis on working with the Government to deliver health and education services, improve agricultural productivity and address employment challenges for youth. This last need is perhaps the most imperative of all. It is indispensable to future stability.

In Afghanistan, our military efforts in Oruzgan province are complemented by similar development programmes. Our efforts to meet the population's needs have highlighted the inextricable link between military, diplomatic and development efforts in establishing a sustainable peace.

Finally, Australia agrees with the Secretary-General's assessment that there is a need to broaden and deepen the pool of civilian experts, including from developing countries, to help develop national capacity in post-conflict societies. The Australian Civilian Corps was established in late 2009 to enable the rapid

deployment of Australian civilians into post-conflict countries in coordination with the local Government and other international actors. We look forward to playing an active part in the forthcoming review of international civilian capacities.

The President: I now give the floor to Mr. Pedro Serrano, acting head of the delegation of the European Union to the United Nations.

Mr. Serrano: Let me begin by thanking you, Mr. President, for having invited the European Union (EU) to this timely and important debate.

The candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Serbia; as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia align themselves with this statement.

Following the established practice, the full version of the European Union statement is being circulated. I will read out an abridged version.

At the outset, I wish to acknowledge the important statements delivered by the Foreign Minister of Japan, the Secretary-General, the ministers of Afghanistan, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste, and the Managing Director of the World Bank. Let me also commend you, Mr. President, for your personal commitment to the peacebuilding cause.

The follow-up to last year's report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304), the 2010 Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) review, and the ongoing reflection on United Nations peacekeeping represent three key priority areas. The European Union will follow and engage in these processes very closely, and certainly in the implementation of the Secretary-General's report and the United Nations civilian capacity review.

On several occasions we have failed to break the cycle of crisis and have missed windows of opportunity for decisive action. The international community has witnessed too many countries relapsing into conflict within short periods of time. The figure of 30 per cent of countries falling back into conflict within five years of a peace agreement is unacceptable in terms of suffering, in terms of missed opportunities and in terms of lost investments. Reversing this trend is a shared responsibility and something we owe the people most affected by conflict.

Building peace is about much more than ending war. Peacebuilding aims at building a vital bridge between short-term crisis management and longer-term efforts to consolidate stability by preventing the recurrence of the conflict cycle through human development, State-building and support to civil society.

We have learned from our common experience over the past decades that no single template can be applied to complex situations in which priority areas span the areas of peace and security, development, humanitarian affairs, human rights and the rule of law, including the fight against impunity.

In order to meet this daunting challenge, the European Union believes that additional efforts should be devoted not only to generating greater national ownership as the foundation for peacebuilding efforts, including by supporting increased participation by women, but also to identifying credible priorities, to designing coherent peacebuilding strategies, to providing rapid, flexible and predictable financial support, and to forging effective national, regional and international partnerships.

The Peacebuilding Commission has the potential to champion that agenda. The case of Sierra Leone is an excellent example that demonstrates the PBC's added value. The European Union is contributing substantially to efforts there, while focusing on good governance, the rehabilitation of priority infrastructure and general budgetary support.

At present, the European Union is engaged worldwide in 12 civilian and military crisis management operations that cover a wide array of activities. We are also cooperating actively with the United Nations in eight different theatres.

The new structures for the management of the EU's external relations, under the leadership of High Representative Ashton, aim at bringing closer together all the instruments at the EU's disposal and at increasing the coherence of the European Union's short-, medium- and long-term actions.

In Timor-Leste, the European Union has provided more than $400 million since 1999 in development and humanitarian assistance. For the period 2009 to 2013, the European Union will continue to provide support to

the people of Timor-Leste, in the amount of $100 million, in areas such as rural development, health and food security, security sector reform and the social integration of internally displaced persons.

Finally, on Afghanistan, contributions to improving governance, electoral reform, the rule of law, respect for human rights and Afghan institution-building are at the heart of the European Union's support in that country. Through its action plan, the European Union, in cooperation with the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan and other international partners, continues to provide long-term assistance to Afghanistan in institution building and civilian capacity programmes, including at the sub-national level.

Let me conclude by reiterating that we cannot fail to meet the challenge of supporting post-conflict countries in building lasting peace. The United Nations, with its global legitimacy and in close partnership and coordination with the main actors, has a central role to play. The European Union remains resolutely determined to actively support those collective efforts to better assist countries in building sustainable peace.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Finland.

Mr. Viinanen (Finland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Nordic countries, namely, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.

Let me join others in thanking Japan for organizing this timely debate, and the Ministers for their valuable remarks.

Five years ago, former Secretary-General Kofi Annan observed that there was a gaping hole in the United Nations institutional machinery. No part of the United Nations system effectively addressed the challenge of helping countries with the transition from war to lasting peace. Member states agreed with Mr. Annan's observation. The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Fund were established. This year, we are assessing how well they have filled that gap and how to improve common peacebuilding efforts. The Nordic countries will continue to stay actively engaged in the review process.

However, peacebuilding is not confined to the PBC alone, but also embraces the much broader scope of policies, interventions and processes, as this debate demonstrates. Indeed, it is very much a collaborative effort of the whole United Nations and beyond. Most important, it is a national task of the country recovering from conflict. We look forward to the discussion later this year on the results of the implementation of recommendations in the Secretary-General's report on Peacebuilding (S/2009/304).

Allow me to highlight a few points that the Nordic countries believe are important for the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, and for peacebuilding more generally.

Peace is much more than the mere absence of violence. Building sustainable peace requires much more than a short-term strategy for security, political stability and the initial dividends of economic recovery. Sustainable peace requires that the foundations of a peaceful society are restored and that a State be accountable to its people. It requires respect for the fundamental rights of each individual, professional and trustworthy rule of law and security institutions and a social compact based on an inclusive and transparent reconciliation process.

The current approach to peacebuilding falls well short of that vision. Mandates and strategies tend to concentrate on short-term deliverables, because ensuring measurable progress on security and political stability is so difficult. But we must try and, in so doing, we must acknowledge the diversity of post-conflict situations.

No peacebuilding policy will be valid in all post-conflict situations. What builds peace in one country does not necessarily build peace in another. International assistance to post-conflict countries must build on an understanding of the country context and allow for more flexibility and adaptability. The international community must move away from imposing unrealistic expectations and timelines for sweeping reforms, keeping in mind that sustainable peace requires a holistic long-term vision and resilience to stay on course.

National ownership built on an inclusive and transparent political process is the basis for effective peacebuilding interventions. That is why the review of the Peacebuilding Commission must focus on delivering added value at the national level and assess whether the United Nations peacebuilding architecture

is sufficiently able to foster and promote nationally owned and coordinated peacebuilding efforts.

The role of the international community, in our view, should be to ensure not only the principle of national ownership but also national accountability to the local population. While supporting transitional governmental structures, the international community should act as a guarantor of the emergence of truly inclusive political processes. Civil society needs to be supported and genuinely consulted. It goes without saying — even though I am saying it — that women, who make up more than half of the population, should be fully included in all peacebuilding and political processes from the beginning.

When the going gets difficult, and it will, it is the role of the international community to stay focused on the goal of inclusive national ownership while accepting necessary risks, including financial ones. That is mutual accountability and partnership with a society recovering from a conflict.

Coordination is another key pillar of mutual accountability. Countries recovering from conflict have to be able to expect a coordinated and supportive approach from the international community. That includes a more coordinated approach from the United Nations intergovernmental bodies, better integration of all relevant United Nations actors and improved coordination between the United Nations and other organizations, such as the international financial institutions. That requires leadership that is able to cut through turf battles. The Nordic countries encourage the Secretary-General and the Security Council to continue to demonstrate proactive leadership in their efforts to achieve that.

Finally, as Member States, we must also look at our own responsibilities. Coordination begins at home. We need to speak with one voice at all levels and pursue a consistent peacebuilding policy in the various multilateral and bilateral settings. As contributors to the broader peacebuilding architecture, we must recommit to that agenda, including by promoting and applying a whole-Government approach, however difficult and challenging that may be.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of India.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Puri (India): Thank you, Mr. President, for convening today's debate on post-conflict peacebuilding and for your concept note (S/2010/167).

At the outset, let me echo the Secretary-General's assertion in his report last year on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict. The imperative of national ownership and the anchoring of international peacebuilding efforts at the country level cannot be overemphasized.

Security is a key pillar of peacebuilding. It is equally important to focus on building economic opportunity, particularly for young people, along with political and social stability. This requires a holistic approach that is sensitive to the economic, social and political milieu of the post-conflict situation. It is also critical to ensure that there is a real stake for the country involved in the peacebuilding efforts. It also means that, even in cases where it is difficult to locate national ownership, international peacebuilding efforts are geared towards strengthening the capacity of a post-conflict State to govern effectively and to govern well. Capacity-building also assumes importance especially in instances where countries find it difficult to completely utilize the financial assistance with which they have been provided.

My delegation is therefore of the view that the international community, acting through the instrumentality of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), must always strive to ensure that there is effective two-way dialogue between countries on the agenda of the PBC and the Commission itself through all stages.

Another key issue is that of financing. Let us be clear and acknowledge the fact that the lack of funding continues to be a major impediment to the success of peacebuilding initiatives. It goes without saying that other elements — such as human resources, technical assistance, managerial assistance, assistance in kind and other programmes of assistance through the provision of appropriate technologies — are also important.

Given the sensitive nature of such peacebuilding tasks as security sector reform and development administration, there must be a high degree of coordination within the United Nations system. Work in the country-specific configurations has been a positive dimension. In particular, the Council would do well to really consult major troop- and police-contributing countries, both individually and through

the instrumentality of the PBC, while formulating and revising the mandates of United Nations missions.

India has shared its unique nation-building experience and expertise with a number of countries transiting from conflict to peace. We are very happy to continue to make available our capabilities in nation-building to countries in post-conflict situations and to cooperate with the United Nations in its various peacebuilding activities.

Ever since the creation of the PBC in December 2005, India has actively participated in its work as a member of its Organizational Committee and by contributing to the resources of the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF). We will continue this active association with the PBC and the PBF with a view to enabling those institutions to fulfil in their entirety the tasks assigned to them by the General Assembly and the Security Council. Further, we are of the view that the Fund should act as a catalyst for good governance. In this regard, we note with approval the creation of the Senior Advisory Group for the Review of International Civilian Capacities, in fulfilment of the agenda for action outlined by the Secretary-General in his 2009 report on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict.

We need to be cognizant that peacebuilding is still a concept in its infancy and is continuously evolving. The international community has taken on board the idea of peacebuilding to fulfil the important need of handling post-conflict situations. It is therefore imperative that we ensure that peacebuilding and the institutions that constitute the peacebuilding architecture are successful.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Solomon Islands.

Mr. Beck (Solomon Islands): Mr. President, my delegation wishes to acknowledge your country's initiative in convening this open debate on the topic "Post-conflict peacebuilding: comprehensive peacebuilding strategy to prevent the recurrence of conflict".

I contribute to the discussions as the representative of a country emerging from conflict and as a current recipient State under a Pacific peacebuilding model, led by Australia and strongly supported by New Zealand, together with the participation of the 14 other Pacific small island developing States. My country receives assistance under the regional arrangement known as the Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands (RAMSI). The six-year old regional Mission is composed of military, police and civilian personnel. The relationship and partnership have generated a tsunami of valuable lessons that I hope will garner the interest of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and this Council.

The Pacific model is provided for under Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter under the subheading "Regional arrangements". It is my wish and hope that we can draw on other peacebuilding experiences and take a fresh look at other models that will enrich today's debate.

I am mindful that our United Nations Peacebuilding Commission has a narrow agenda that focuses only on four countries. The question remains: What happens to other countries emerging from conflict? Who deals with them, if not the PBC?

In sharing my country's experience, let me give the Council some brief information on my country. Solomon Islands has a population of more than half a million people, speaking some 87 different languages. More than 85 per cent of the population is located in the rural areas. Back in late 1998, ethnic tension erupted, leading to a two-year conflict between two ethnic groups that brought the country to its knees and saw law and order take an ugly turn. RAMSI entered the country in 2003 at the invitation of the Government of Solomon Islands, and today continues to play a supporting role in rebuilding the country.

For many countries ravaged by wars, peacebuilding is about security, development and nation-building. Security is a priority in all early phases of peacemaking, and remains so within a changing environment. Sufficient investment must be made within the development sector if true peace is to be attained. This means that the PBC must understand the environment in which it is operating, be flexible in its approach in order to adapt to the changing environment and, most important, anticipate change in any form of crisis, be it climate change, energy, food or financial. Any of these crises will shock national systems and exacerbate the problems therein.

Security, human rights and the rule of law naturally follow the lead of development. The argument is that we cannot guarantee security or human rights to populations until they are provided with economic opportunities and become active

participants in the economy; otherwise, any peace gain will remain fragile and unpredictable.

On security sector reform, if any peacebuilding mechanism is to succeed, it is important that confidence in the State institutions be restored. This means allowing the State to lead in all initiatives and providing it with the necessary tools and equipment. The United Nations can build confidence in State institutions by providing space for locally trained police forces to participate in the Organization's missions. This would be tantamount to a pronouncement and announcement by the international community that public trust in new State security institutions has been restored.

On Governance, more attention also must be paid to provincial and community governance structures. In many peacebuilding initiatives, the focus remains on State institutions within the capital. The paucity of investment in the other arms of Government outside capitals have hampered States in their efforts to carry out their core functions on behalf of their scattered populations.

Many of the governance systems adopted by developing countries do not always recognize traditional and customary laws in a specific way. At times, modern legislation clashes with traditional mechanisms. These are issues that should not be allowed to fester and grow.

One area I wish to bring to the Council's attention, and that is not covered in the concept paper before the Council (S/2010/167), is that of partnership between the PBC and the receiving State and the management of that relationship. Solomon Islands enjoys stability under the RAMSI partnership. However, sporadic flare-ups on the law and order front have allowed Solomon Islands and RAMSI to fine-tune their cooperation in containing emerging national security problems. The partnership framework, previously referred to by New Zealand, provides for dynamic and robust cooperation between the two parties.

There must be a smart partnership between the PBC and the receiving State — a partnership that is about increasing the State's system-wide capacity with skills and support to improve its delivery of services to its populations; that addresses the underlying causes of conflict; and that avoids ad hoc coordination assistance outside the Government machinery and an unbalanced assistance that further undermines the State, making the support unsustainable in the long run and turning State actors into spectators.

My final point concerns international efforts. Any country emerging from conflict must be able to create funds from within the State. In the Solomon Islands, this can be done with investment in selected areas, such as energy, which accounts for a third of its national budget, and agriculture, mainly in rice. This will free up millions of dollars in allowing the country to ensure that much of its peacebuilding programme is sustainable.

Let me close, Sir, by once again thanking you for this opportunity. I also take this opportunity to thank my Pacific colleagues — in particular Australia, New Zealand and my colleagues from the Pacific small island developing States — for their support to the Solomon Islands via the Regional Assistance Mission.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of El Salvador.

Mrs. Gallardo Hernández (El Salvador) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation welcomes your initiative, Sir, to convene this open debate of the Security Council on post-conflict peacebuilding, in particular during this year, 2010, when we will review the progress made by and challenges facing the Peacebuilding Commission five years after its creation. We also thank the Secretary-General for his ongoing support for peacebuilding efforts through the Peacebuilding Support Office and his leadership at the head of the Peacebuilding Fund.

El Salvador reaffirms its commitment to the objectives and goals of the Peacebuilding Commission, given the Commission's significant contribution in support of the efforts of countries emerging from conflicts, in particular those now on the Commission's agenda.

It is also worth noting the importance of the valuable lessons learned that we have been able to identify collectively within the framework of the Commission's Working Group on Lessons Learned, which El Salvador was honoured to chair for three years. These lessons must serve us in all peacebuilding processes being carried out in countries on the agenda of the Commission, as well as in others.

We are aware that each conflict has its own specificities. The Commission must therefore make an

even greater effort to promote a comprehensive approach that devotes special attention to these particular characteristics and also takes into account the priorities agreed upon by domestic actors and national ownership. In this regard, my delegation wishes to reiterate the need to continue to involve all relevant bodies of the United Nations system in the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, including the Economic and Social Council and its subsidiary bodies, in particular the agencies, funds and programmes that, let us not forget, are carrying out operational activities for development in the field.

The country-specific configurations continue to play a special role in the activities of the Commission. In this regard, the effectiveness of their work is essential if we wish to achieve the goals and objectives that the Peacebuilding Commission has set for itself. We also recall the importance of strengthening coordination and cooperation among the various national and international actors in the field and here at Headquarters, in order to ensure that the synergies that emerge between the two can make an effective contribution to Governments' national peacebuilding efforts and do not become an obstacle to the process.

Moreover, in the view of my delegation, the time is ripe for us to give further thought to the nature, scope and time frame in which the comprehensive peacebuilding strategy is to be carried out. While this tool was provided for in the founding resolutions of the Commission, practice has demonstrated that we need to show some flexibility during the design and implementation phase so that it does not become an obstacle to the peacebuilding process. Furthermore, it is important for the Commission to seriously consider those elements or conditions that must be observed in the deployment of an exit strategy. The Commission's work in a given country cannot last indefinitely. The successful experience of El Salvador is proof of that.

The Security Council undoubtedly has an important role to play in supporting the work of the Peacebuilding Commission. Therefore, we believe it appropriate to strengthen the channels of communication and exchange of views between this organ, the country-specific configurations and, in a broader context, the Commission's Organizational Committee.

In the view of El Salvador, the Security Council, acting in coordination with the General Assembly, can provide a genuinely strategic, more in-depth vision for the Peacebuilding Commission. In addition, the existing ties between peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations can be strengthened. This relationship must also be reflected in greater cooperation between the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Peacebuilding Support Office in order to maximalize the vision, the follow-up and, of course, resources. We also believe it important to strengthen synergies and coherence between the strategies of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund, and to redouble in turn the cooperative efforts between the Commission and relevant regional bodies.

In conclusion, let me reiterate the conviction of the Government of El Salvador that the new peacebuilding architecture is a very valuable tool for the international community to the extent that it will enable us to meet the challenges facing countries emerging from conflict. That will benefit peacekeeping and security worldwide, as well as peoples that, like ours, have undertaken efforts to build lasting peace.

The President: I call on the representative of Sri Lanka.

Mr. Kohona (Sri Lanka): My delegation appreciates the initiative of the Japanese presidency in organizing this important debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. It is a most timely initiative. I also wish to extend, on behalf of my delegation, our warmest greetings to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan and the other Ministers who are with us here today for this important meeting.

Sri Lanka associates itself fully with the statement to be delivered by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The United Nations, as we all know, was established in the hope that it would contribute to the collective effort to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. We can all take pride in the fact that, in the 65 years since then, the world as a whole has not been at war. However, in the same period, intra-State and inter-State conflicts have become widespread. Therefore, our collective efforts to bring conflicts to an end and to prevent the recurrence of conflicts in post-conflict contexts cannot cease.

The Peacebuilding Commission was conceived with an awareness of the characteristics of successful peacebuilding efforts. We must nevertheless not ignore

the lessons of the other home-grown strategies that countries have successfully implemented to achieve and consolidate peace. There are many instances in which strategies developed on the basis of national experience have succeeded much better than those prescribed in hallowed academic institutions. We must accept that all peacebuilding efforts are unique, as the nature and context of individual conflicts are different. There must be no one-size-fits-all principle applied in supporting the specific situation of any given country. Any tendency to impose predetermined solutions for achieving peace and reconciliation must be resisted, however much we are attached to them.

We recognize that the international community has a responsibility to ensure that post-conflict situations do not relapse into conflict and to encourage and facilitate national efforts to achieve lasting peace. We need to listen to national Governments and communities, which understand better what a country's and a people's priorities are. Peacebuilding must squarely be a nationally owned process, and peace must come from within and not from the outside. Our own experience has shown that some in the international community expect benchmarks to be achieved according to artificial timelines and feel that external pressure could help speed up a process, disregarding complex domestic sensitivities and ground realities. Quite often, the progress made is ignored when it is not consistent with external prescriptions, and there is a constant focus only on what remains to be achieved. This approach has resulted quite often in the rejection of external interference and confusion in the domestic processes, thereby weakening the influence of the international community.

In many situations, time can heal many wounds, provided it is augmented by necessary confidence-building measures. Quite often, a great deal of emphasis is placed on political reconciliation alone, without the realization that the economic empowerment of people needs to be given equal priority. Poverty, unemployment, unequal opportunities and an ensuing sense of grievance have often led to the radicalization of communities and provided the base of support for armed conflict. Whilst these social issues may manifest themselves as ethno-national or religious conflicts, the core grievance may very possibly be a sense of marginalization, especially economic.

Peacebuilding is a multidimensional task that requires a comprehensive approach. The immediate needs of people in post-conflict societies include rehabilitation, resettlement, basic services, safety and security, the rebuilding of basic infrastructure, economic opportunities through employment and the regaining of lost livelihoods. Unless economic opportunities are provided, no amount of political facilitation or punitive measures will bring peace. One classic definition of peace is the normalization of the life of the people. No peacebuilding can be successful without winning the hearts and minds of the people. Economic recovery must take place in parallel with the strengthening of democratic processes, the rule of law and human rights. The international community has a significant role to play in assisting with the economic recovery phase in post-conflict scenarios.

Considerable focus needs to be placed on healing the wounds and achieving reconciliation among peoples in countries where conflicts have divided communities for decades. Those who shout from the rooftops for justice or revenge against the alleged perpetrators of crimes come from a certain socio-cultural milieu where revenge is seen as a healer. In our part of the world, a culture going back millennia dictates that mercy must be shown by the victor. Mercy, forgiveness and a need to come to terms with the past, however bitter it may have been, on a morally acceptable basis, in order to advance the cause of reconciliation and long-term stability are key to our cultural experience. As the Bard so aptly wrote of the quality of mercy "is twice blest. It blesseth him that gives and him that takes". Forgiveness, rather than punishment and revenge, is the major influence in our context. Therefore, we need to recognize the different approaches to addressing the ways conflicts last and can be resolved, and once again agree that there is no one-size-fits-all formula.

Our own experience has shown us that we must allow democratic processes to be established for the people to elect their leaders and to allow the people who have lived through years of conflict to come forward and take the initiative in rebuilding their communities and deciding their political future, rather than having solutions based on a judgmental assessment of their aspirations imposed upon them. Those who have been through long-running conflicts often take a very different approach to how they would want to shape their future, and, very often, old ideas

that gave rise to the conflicts in the first place no longer remain a priority for these communities. Therefore, political solutions in post-conflict societies, in our experience, should not precede the firm establishment of democratic processes and proper consultation.

Post-conflict peacebuilding also requires considerable financial resources, and, in many countries emerging from conflict, one of the major challenges is finding the resources to consolidate peace. Very often, support from the donor community is conditional upon our accepting its formulas for peacebuilding. We believe that the Peacebuilding Fund could be a channel through which national processes can be supported on their own merits.

We hope that our candid views on post-conflict peace building strategies based on our own experience may contribute to the ongoing dialogue on how best to sustain and achieve durable peace. Sri Lanka fully supports the major review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture being conducted under the auspices of the General Assembly, and we hope this debate may contribute to that review.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Ghana.

Mr. Christian (Ghana): On behalf of the delegation of Ghana, I wish to congratulate Japan on its assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April and on having organized this debate. I also congratulate Gabon on having ably presided over the affairs of the Council in March. We appreciate the statement made by the Secretary-General this morning.

When, in April 2005, the Governments of Ghana and Denmark jointly organized a workshop on peacebuilding in Accra to mobilize support for the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), many participants had no doubt in their minds that peacebuilding pre-dated the PBC. Nonetheless, they were quite convinced that the notion of peacebuilding — as variously articulated in the reports of the Secretary-General entitled "An Agenda for Peace" (S/24111) and "In Larger Freedom" (A/59/2005) — was that it should enable the United Nations to add value by filling an institutional gap and ensuring that peacebuilding efforts became sustainable and effective. In the ongoing review exercise, the added value of the PBC must be kept in mind.

The goal of attaining sustainable peace is not an event, but a process requiring the sustained attention of the international community. To be sustainable, peacebuilding processes should aim at deepening the culture of peace, democracy and respect for the rule of law, justice, human rights and international legality.

The PBC is a conflict-prevention mechanism to the extent that it is mandated to mobilize resources and seek the support of the international community to prevent post-conflict countries from suffering relapses. Thus, in the course of the ongoing review exercise, attention should be given to the need to strengthen the PBC as an early warning mechanism, relying on lessons learned not only for the benefit of countries on its agenda that stand the risk of relapsing into violent conflicts, but also for pre-conflict countries.

This perspective may be better appreciated when one considers that, in some cases, the international community has failed to respond in a timely manner when danger has loomed in some countries in post-conflict situations, as the peace they had once enjoyed was taken for granted. The PBC should be able to advise the Security Council on situations on the Council's agenda, taking advantage of the lessons learned in cases where there is credible information pointing to the possibility of a violent conflict occurring while giving due deference to national sensitivities. In doing so, the PBC would fulfil the objective of filling an institutional gap within the conflict-prevention apparatus of the United Nations in a more holistic and comprehensive manner.

The PBC must pay equal, if not more, attention to the need to mobilize not only the international community but also national stakeholders for sustainable peace, as a nation cannot have peace without the active engagement of its homegrown peacebuilders. Thus, although Ghana is not a country in a post-conflict situation, it is now implementing a peacebuilding framework, the National Architecture for Peace in Ghana. The broad policy objective is to facilitate the development of mechanisms for cooperation among all the relevant stakeholders in peacebuilding in Ghana by institutionalizing responses to conflicts aimed at achieving social, political and religious reconciliation and transformative dialogues. The National Architecture also includes the introduction of the culture of peace into the curriculum of schools in Ghana and building the capacity of national and local institutions to manage grievances in

a democratic environment anchored in the rule of law and access to justice. A key component of this architecture is the promotion of free and independent media to create a space for public debates on issues before the nation in a manner that allows all voices to be heard without fear.

The National Architecture for Peace in Ghana obviously takes inspiration from the national Constitution, which provides for an independent judiciary, an independent media free from all governmental control, and an independent electoral commission, as well as the directive principles of State policy, which call for equitable national development and social inclusiveness and non-discrimination.

Education should play a key role in almost all the national dimensions of peacebuilding identified in the concept paper for this debate (S/2010/167), whether they be security sector reform, the reintegration of soldiers, alleviating poverty and unemployment, avoiding discrimination against women or ensuring gender balance. For example, a society cannot effectively integrate its former child soldiers or help them to obtain decent jobs without first giving them books instead of bullets. High unemployment among women and girls can be mitigated by ending discrimination against women in many societies in the areas of access to education and social life. In recognition of the value of education, Ghana's national Constitution provides for free, compulsory universal basic education targeting girls and boys in equal measure. To this end, Ghana welcomes the efforts by the PBC and Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon aimed at mainstreaming women in peacebuilding.

Ghana also welcomes the emphasis placed on national ownership. In the context of ensuring sustainable peace in post-conflict countries, the principle of respect for national ownership or sovereignty should accommodate the principle of solidarity. Ghana will therefore urge the PBC to continue to explore appropriate strategies to engage regional and subregional organizations in order to enhance coordination and coherence through an integrated approach to the delivery of their respective peacebuilding mandates, in collaboration with civil society and donors.

The promotion of coordination and cooperation among various stakeholders interested in assisting countries on the PBC agenda will help minimize or avoid situations in which national authorities are compelled to choose between conflicting priorities that might be set by competing stakeholders in such a way that competition to claim exclusive peacebuilding credit becomes the enemy of cooperation.

Ghana acknowledges the efforts made by successive Presidents of the PBC and Chairpersons of the country-specific configurations to reach out to the African Union (AU) in order to dialogue on peacebuilding issues. However, more needs to be done to achieve an effective triangulation of efforts among the United Nations, the AU or the regional organization concerned, and the countries on the PBC's agenda in order to more effectively deliver as one. It is the Ghana delegation's view that, to this end, the convening of a joint session of the PBC and the AU Peace and Security Council to review the peacebuilding strategy for the countries on the PBC's agenda would be a step in the right direction.

In the area of capacity-building, the mere existence of the Peacebuilding Commission should not lead to a misleading assumption that the United Nations is adequately equipped with the requisite range of tools — be they human and material resources, information or other — to carry out peacebuilding tasks, let alone to assist countries on its agenda to improve their capacity for post-conflict peace consolidation. The test of any effective peacebuilding capacity should be to pose the question "the capacity to do what?" and to put in place the appropriate monitoring or evaluation mechanisms to ensure the effectiveness of capacity-building for peacebuilding.

The adoption of the African Union Framework for Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development speaks to the necessity to look at development in a broad sense in terms of its contribution to peace consolidation, thereby moving beyond the question, often asked, of whether the PBC is designed to handle development. Moreover, peacebuilding and peacekeeping should not be seen as mutually exclusive. The question that must be addressed is how to employ the entire available and legitimate range of tools and resources in order to prevent a country in a post-conflict situation from relapsing into violent conflict and to ensure that it is in a position to achieve sustainable peace, including by addressing the root causes.

We hope that Ghana's statement will contribute to the search for ways to move the United Nations peacebuilding agenda forward.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Rwanda.

Mr. Gasana (Rwanda): At the outset, allow me to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. Let me join others in commending your delegation for convening this debate and for the instructive concept note (S/2010/167) distributed to facilitate this discussion. We are grateful for and welcome the opportunity to contribute to this debate, and we thank the Secretary-General and all those who have put forward recommendations that we believe will greatly enhance our consideration of this issue.

Many post-conflict reconstruction efforts tend to follow a common path, establishing a semblance of a functioning administration, providing security and economic recovery in order to create prosperity, and empowering citizens to take ownership in democratic governance. However, despite these similarities, we should remember that each situation is unique to its own specific historical context. Allow me therefore to make the following points in contribution to this debate.

To realize effective peacebuilding in post-conflict countries, emphasis should be placed on national ownership. Post-conflict needs are evident, and peacebuilding plays a significant role in mitigating and addressing those needs. As such, peacebuilding should be given adequate and appropriate support in the form of human and financial resources.

The creation of an effective and efficient peacebuilding architecture is crucial to conducting and operationalizing peacebuilding mandates. It is equally important to have a mechanism for mutual accountability that monitors the commitments of all actors.

Post-conflict management should avoid leaving a vacuum that could lead to a recurrence of violence. If peacebuilding is to fill the gap, there must be effective coordination among the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. Peacebuilding should involve the formulation of an exit strategy and should avoid perpetual dependency.

We are encouraged by the leadership the German delegation brings to the PBC and, in particular, by the focused approach on those issues, which we believe will make the Peacebuilding Commission perform better.

In conclusion, if there is any lesson to be learned from Rwanda's reconstruction experience, it is that there is a need to understand the root causes of conflict and to address them, using universal values that incorporate home-grown solutions.

The President: I give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Téte António, Permanent Observer of the African Union to the United Nations.

Mr. António (*spoke in French*): Given the lateness of the hour, I shall not read out my prepared text but will instead sum up my ideas. First, I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for having convened this meeting. This morning we carefully listened to the statements of the Secretary-General, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan and Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ministers from Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste, and of course, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan.

We commend this innovative initiative. This morning we had an opportunity not only to listen to countries on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission, but we also heard about interesting efforts, which could serve as lessons, from countries that are not on the Commission's agenda. I believe that we will take those experiences into account when we undertake the review exercise.

In speaking of the African Union I will limit myself to reiterating comments made earlier by the representative of Ghana. As the Council is aware, the African Union has developed its Policy Framework on Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development aimed at ensuring that countries do not relapse into conflict. Above all, we have included the development aspect in our approach. We have had the opportunity to address the Council on the value of the Peacebuilding Commission and the United Nations considering the development aspect when addressing peacebuilding issues. I believe that is a gap that we should not fear addressing when reviewing the Peacebuilding Commission.

The African Union has also incorporated the root causes into its approach: we believe it is impossible to

build peace without addressing the root causes of conflict. I think that too is a contribution that could also be used in the United Nations approach to peacebuilding.

The African Union Policy Framework is based on certain principles such as national ownership, African leadership, non-discrimination and, in particular, inclusiveness. We know that partnerships are necessary to achieve all the aims of peacebuilding. Thus we propose the creation of an institutionalized partnership between the multidimensional communities involved in the African Union Policy Framework on Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development on the one hand and the Peacebuilding Commission on the other.

Steps have already been taken. The African Union and the Peacebuilding Commission have already met, and the Chair of the PBC visited Addis Ababa with a large delegation. We must see how to transform our discussions into reality. There was also a meeting with the African Union Peace and Security Council, which is an important element of the African Union's peace and security structure. Meetings between the African Union Peace and Security Council and the United Nations Security Council should be more than just pro forma encounters. We must ensure that these meetings lead to facts with a genuine impact on the partnership we are building with the United Nations.

I think there are already lessons to be learned from work on the ground. As the Council is aware, the United Nations and the African Union are involved in Darfur through the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur. I think there are lessons being learned there that could also prove useful in the review of the Peacebuilding Commission and in the approach being developed by the United Nations.

The representative of Ghana was very eloquent in addressing the regional aspect. We need to truly involve the regions in peacebuilding. Ghana proposed a far more integrated approach for cooperation among the United Nations, the African Union and the regional organizations, and we fully support that approach.

In practice, the African Union is currently involved on the ground through its regional and other offices and through its special envoys. We have undertaken efforts in certain countries on the Peacebuilding Commission agenda. There are situations that are of concern, such as that in Guinea-Bissau, which the Peace and Security Council and the Security Council have been addressing. We believe that the expected outcome will not occur until defence and security sector reform has occurred in that country. We therefore need to encourage regional efforts — those of the Economic Community of West African States and the African Union — and also to encourage bilateral cooperation: I think there are countries, even on the African continent, that are interested in helping Guinea-Bissau. Thus it is important to encourage such bilateral cooperation.

There are other salient aspects in countries where the Peacebuilding Commission is involved. I am thinking, for example, of youth employment. Numerous delegations have repeatedly addressed this issue in the Security Council and in the Peacebuilding Commission. We cannot build peace unless we build a future for young people. Young people are the future, and unless they have support and a future before them, there is little point in talking about peacebuilding.

Of late, we have come before the Security Council a number of times to discuss various aspects of peacebuilding. We have spoken of exit strategies and of post-conflict peacebuilding, which is what we are discussing today. Perhaps we should now think about how we are going to turn the results of all of these discussions into reality and about how they will have an impact on the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, which we are in the process of reviewing.

We also listened with great interest to the Secretary-General's statement this morning, in particular with regard to the establishment of an advisory group to be led by Mr. Guéhenno, with whose experience we are all familiar. It would be desirable for that advisory group to work in close coordination with the Peacebuilding Commission and all partners.

Above all, we would like to emphasize the point made about the need to listen to those who are involved in peacebuilding on a daily basis, that is, the people concerned. In that connection, we welcome the initiative of the facilitators of the PBC review process to go to Addis Ababa to speak to the Commission.

We also know that South Africa — and I stand to be corrected — is considering organizing a seminar with non-governmental organizations and populations on the ground who are suffering every day and who know what it is to have peace or not. I think these are the types of forums that we need to encourage in order to move forward effectively in this effort.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Thailand.

Mr. Srivali (Thailand): Thailand would like to thank Japan for organizing this timely debate on post-conflict peacebuilding and for its excellent and comprehensive concept paper (S/2010/167). Thailand aligns itself with the statement to be delivered by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

We wish to emphasize three aspects of peacebuilding that we believe are crucial to its success. The first is the need to foster national ownership, which many delegations have mentioned. National ownership must be accompanied by the strengthening of national capacity. Indispensable to that idea is the notion of nation-building — a process whereby all stakeholders and their interests are integrated into a set of shared goals, norms and values. In post-conflict societies, that means that institutions of governance and operational mechanisms will have to be developed that not only conform to international standards, but also reflect local needs and conditions.

Building a sense of national ownership therefore goes beyond the simple transfer of administrative power to local authorities. It also requires constant recalibration and continuous dialogue between the national Government and local constituents, including civil society and minorities. It may also require continued consultation and coordination with the international community, at least in the initial stages.

The second is the participation of women and youth. Since it is mostly men who are participants in conflict, it is important to bring out the role of women to help stabilize post-conflict environments. At the same time, the element of unemployed and undereducated youth is a potential risk factor that must be addressed in order to prevent a society from relapsing into conflict. The economic empowerment of women and youth could help dampen the potential root causes of conflict and encourage greater ownership in the peacebuilding process. Programmes in such areas as general education, literacy and vocational training should therefore be given high priority in order to ensure the sustainability of peace.

The third point that my delegation wishes to emphasize is that the transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding and sustainable development should be seamless. It can be difficult to pinpoint exactly where peacekeeping ends and peacebuilding begins. There will inevitably be a period of overlap where coordination among all parties involved is essential to ensure the coherence of the process. We therefore encourage close cooperation and consultation between the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and other United Nations bodies, especially the Economic and Social Council, as well as other United Nations agencies such as the United Nations Development Programme and UNICEF. The PBC should also draw upon experiences and best practices in the United Nations system to enhance peacebuilding activities. In addition, close cooperation with international financial institutions and private foundations can help to address financing gaps and urgent needs, improve financing efficiency, avoid the duplication of work and ensure coherence in peacebuilding.

Peacebuilding is an enormously complex and multifaceted task. As a member of the PBC Organizational Committee, Thailand is committed to continuing to work closely with our partners to further improve and strengthen the Commission. We hope that the 2010 PBC review will result in a more efficient, flexible and adaptive approach to peacebuilding challenges in post-conflict situations around the world.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Botswana.

Mr. Ntwaagae (Botswana): Botswana is pleased to see you, Sir, personally presiding over the business of the Council today. We have no doubt that, under your presidency, the Council will surpass all expectations in the conduct of its work.

My delegation wishes to associate itself with the statement to be delivered by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Botswana attaches great importance to the promotion of post-conflict peacebuilding. In that connection, we welcome your initiative, Mr. President, to hold this Security Council open debate on the subject. Let me also commend you for inviting the eminent persons who were with us for the major part of the morning and who are with us today, all of whom have unrivalled knowledge and experience in the subject matter of today's debate.

We were also pleased and satisfied to take note of the presence of the Secretary-General here this morning, as well as the Ministers from Afghanistan,

Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste. Their presence here demonstrated the great importance of the subject matter under discussions, as well as that of the issue of comprehensive peacebuilding to prevent the recurrence of conflict. Let me also recognize the presence of the Permanent Representative of Germany, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, whom I wish to commend for his effective stewardship of that body.

Botswana maintains that it is important to ensure collaboration and synergy in the programmes and activities of the various United Nations entities — such as the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council — in the broad area of peacebuilding and the management of conflict. This open debate is a perfect example of such coordination and collaboration.

We all agree that peace, safety and stability are prerequisites for the achievement of sustainable development. The causes of conflict, particularly in Africa, include the absence of political tolerance, democracy, good governance and the rule of law, as well as the inequitable distribution of revenue earned from natural resources within States. Botswana therefore wishes to emphasize the significance of supporting the democratization process and institutional development as crucial measures for the prevention of conflict and the laying of the foundation for sustainable socio-economic development.

In order to leave a positive mark where peacebuilding interventions are made, we must ensure effective coordination between the United Nations, host Governments, bilateral donors and civil society so that the delivery of all well-intended international assistance encourages national ownership and observes strict procedures to minimize the unintended sponsorship of conflict. Botswana also believes that investing in the reconstruction and rehabilitation of physical infrastructure, as well as in social and economic programmes, is a vital part of post-conflict reconstruction.

Addressing the needs and challenges of such vulnerable groups as youth, children, women, the disabled and the injured should be an integral part of effective peacebuilding. That is all the more significant because those groups of victims usually play little or no role at all in the incitement, planning and execution of violent conflict, but suffer the most from its effects. Peacebuilding initiatives should therefore be accompanied by relief efforts and the provision of infrastructure such as schools, water reticulation systems, primary health care and related services, and the revitalization of key economic sectors.

Botswana believes that post-conflict peacebuilding can succeed if we place a high premium on the national ownership of not only actual reconstruction activities, but also in determining the development priorities for which international assistance is being provided.

We are pleased, Mr. President, that you have convened this open debate at a time when we are preparing for the mandated review of the Peacebuilding Commission this year. It is very important that the ideas generated during this debate be allowed to feed into the review process. In that regard, Botswana supports the adoption of the draft presidential statement at the end of this open debate.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to reiterate Botswana's commitment to the realization of global peace and security as a prerequisite to development, dignified human existence, effective governance and the pursuit of prosperity. We cannot overemphasize the need for cooperation at the regional, bilateral and international levels, as well as cooperation among the various United Nations entities, in order to attain long-term peace, stability and development through processes accepted by all at the strategic, operational and institutional levels.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Uruguay.

Mr. Álvarez (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): Allow me to commend the delegation of Japan for having convened this open debate, whose intrinsic importance was underscored by the presence this morning of important officials. Who better than the representatives of the countries that have experienced such a crucial transitional phase and achieved positive results to illustrate for us — through their experiences, mistakes and successes – that each case is different and to remind us that we cannot effectively apply a single approach to differing situations?

Peacebuilding is a complex long- and medium-term process that encompasses a broad range of tasks and stakeholders that require coordination and coherence. The United Nations is certainly just one of the actors involved. In many cases, it is not the most

relevant one — at least when it comes to financial contributions, which are a crucial element in such a critical phase. Nevertheless, due to the unique legitimacy derived from its universally representative character, it is of course the United Nations that is expected to play a central role in mobilizing and coordinating support to countries emerging from conflict.

Nevertheless, given that peacebuilding encompasses a considerable range of thematic issues and owing to the very structure of the Organization, when it comes to making that concept a reality, significant challenges arise within the United Nations system in the areas of leadership, coordination and the definition of responsibilities, which we need to address. The establishment of a body specifically mandated to take up this issue should have helped, in large measure, to resolve this problem. However, in spite of the substantial contribution made by the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) since its inception, in particular in countries on its agenda, its place within the Organization and the support resources at its disposal are insufficient to maximize its potential.

In that regard, although there seems to be a certain degree of consensus as to the need to strengthen the PBC, we also have the impression that, in the context of the difficult review process currently under way, substantive differences exist as to its role and structure. To that end, we could focus on making timely and viable changes that strengthen the PBC and, above all, try to increase its added value on the ground. We have trust in the leadership of the Chair of the Organizational Committee, as well as in the work of the facilitators, to achieve a positive outcome to the current review process.

Along with its legitimacy, the United Nations has a comparative advantage in helping affected countries to define comprehensive and integrated peacebuilding strategies, which are crucial to ensuring sustainable peace and development. In that regard, as we have said on other occasions, there can hardly be sustainable peace in countries emerging from armed conflict if the causes of those conflicts are not addressed.

Security sector reform is another extremely important thematic area in which the United Nations can bring relevant added value. In this as in other areas, it is essential to enjoy abundant and flexible financial and human resources. In that connection, we should keep especially in mind the comparative advantage of civilian experts from developing countries. That will require the expanded use of South-South and triangular cooperation mechanisms. We should also make maximal use of the presence of Blue Helmets in carrying out peacebuilding tasks.

It is indisputable that there can be no development without security. However, security alone is not enough to sustainably consolidate stability and peace. Any peacebuilding strategy should therefore include elements that serve to promote social and economic development.

Although when we talk about strategies we tend to think about the medium and long terms, it is essential that we keep in mind the immediate and short-term dimensions in the aftermath of a conflict so as to produce tangible results – such as the restoration of basic services – at the onset of peace processes. In doing so, in addition to appreciating the inherent benefits of peace, the parties would see the desirability of having launched such a process. That would also serve to generate trust among the parties involved.

In conclusion, with regard to the guiding principles of peacebuilding efforts, allow me to point out that it can indeed seem nearly impossible to find broad consensus in the formulation of an agreed national strategy in politically and ethnically divided societies that have just torn themselves apart. The principle of national ownership can also appear to be an empty concept in devastated countries with limited institutional capacity. Nevertheless, it is the best way to proceed not just because it is the most correct politically, but because it avoids sowing the seeds of discord and resurgent conflict. It is the way to promote sustainable peace.

Therefore, above and beyond the existing differences in each situation, when the international community finds in a given country emerging from conflict leadership that is clear, conciliatory and able to achieve political stability and national reconciliation, it should not squander the opportunity to decisively and sustainably promote its efforts to consolidate peace and to promote economic and social development. The examples we have heard today speak to that. The counter-weight would be a transparent and reciprocal mechanism of accountability among all stakeholders involved.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Bangladesh.

Mr. Momem (Bangladesh): My delegation commends the Japanese presidency for having organized this timely debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. I thank the Secretary-General for his comments earlier in the day. I also thank the Ministers of Japan, Afghanistan, Sierra Leone, Timor-Leste and Bosnia and Herzegovina, who participated in the debate today.

I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM).

The General Assembly is the main deliberative body of the United Nations, composed of representatives of all Member States, and is entrusted with the responsibility of addressing important questions relating to peace and security, among other significant matters. The Non-Aligned Movement hereby reiterates the crucial relevance of the General Assembly, while having regard for the powers and responsibilities of other organs in the fulfilment of their respective obligations.

This debate takes place against the backdrop of a major review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, which is being conducted under the auspices of the General Assembly, as stipulated in resolution 60/180. The Movement seeks to reassure itself that the discussion in this Council is aimed at augmenting the efforts for a successful completion of that process.

It is the view of NAM that the potential inherent in the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) as an advisory body is far from being fully utilized. We should engage ourselves in defining how the PBC can capitalize on its current composition, in accordance with operative paragraph 4 of resolution 60/180, so as to draw on the competitive advantages and expertise of the diverse representation of the general membership in the Organizational Committee, in particular the representation of the United Nations Charter bodies.

The Non-Aligned Movement places significant value on the PBC, particularly its role in support of the national ownership — I repeat, national ownership — of post-conflict peacebuilding priority planning and initiatives. There is concurrence and broad consensus within the Commission that economic reconstruction and rehabilitation and job creation should be at the forefront of all efforts aimed at sustaining peace, initiating development and promoting post-conflict recovery.

Like any new and fledgling apparatus, the PBC has experienced difficulties in accomplishing its given mandate. Despite many challenges, the PBC has made good progress in addressing the challenges of the four countries on its agenda. I would like to highlight the following important issues that my group believes need to be addressed to strengthen the ability of the PBC to contribute actively to the efforts for post-conflict peacebuilding.

First, the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council should fully utilize the ongoing 2010 review to realize the potential inherent in the PBC as an advisory body to achieve its ultimate goal of preventing countries from relapsing into conflict.

Secondly, NAM highlights the need to clearly define how the PBC can ensure a successful peacebuilding strategy through a better coordination among all actors — including the international financial institutions, the United Nations agencies, funds and programmes, the private sector and civil society organizations that are operating on the ground — in order to maximize synergies in the peacebuilding process. In this regard, NAM stresses that, in crafting peacekeeping mandates, the Council should clearly define the role of peacekeeping operations in the peacebuilding process.

Thirdly, NAM strongly emphasizes the importance of partnerships and early investments to economic recovery and development in the peacebuilding process and in the sustenance of peace. The international community must ensure from the very beginning a coherent and predictable deployment of resources in countries emerging from conflict. NAM stresses that that there can be no lasting peace without development, and no sustainable development without stability.

Fourthly, NAM reiterates that it is of the utmost importance that the gender perspective be reflected as an essential element in the peacebuilding process.

Fifthly, the PBC should continue to work in cooperation with national or transitional authorities in full conformity with the principle of national ownership.

Finally, the PBC needs to develop a more dynamic relationship with the Secretary-General with a view to providing effective guidance to the peacebuilding efforts of the United Nations. In this respect, it is imperative to strengthen the capacity of the Peacebuilding Support Office with a view to promoting more integrated and strategic United Nations responses in post-conflict countries, keeping in mind the need for better support to peacebuilding activities on the ground.

Looking ahead, the Non-Aligned Movement is convinced that the upcoming debate in the review process will undoubtedly contribute to strengthening the PBC in addressing critical peacebuilding needs. The Non-Aligned Movement believes that the debate in this Council will, of course, add value in gaining further momentum for the subsequent discussions on the 2010 review of the PBC now taking place in the General Assembly.

In closing, we should not lose sight of the urgent need to provide necessary support to the PBC with a view to fulfilling its mandate. A failure to do so will cast shadows in the minds of those who need our attention the most — the people who are suffering from the curse of conflict. We cannot and should not bypass, in the name of the scale and complexity of peacebuilding needs, the critical role that the PBC can play in bringing lasting peace and sustainable development to post-conflict countries.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Papua New Guinea.

Mr. Aisi (Papua New Guinea): I commend you, Mr. President, and the delegation of Japan for convening this important meeting of the Security Council. I would also commend the statement just delivered by our colleague, the Ambassador of Bangladesh.

This statement is in large part a reflection of our recent tragic experiences in the Bougainville conflict. But more importantly, in the context of this debate, the resolution of the Bougainville conflict under the auspices of the United Nations, this Council and our regional partners stands as a testament to a number of the core issues that this debate is centred upon.

We fully agree that we have to consider — as you, Sir, have rightly noted in your concept paper — "a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy to prevent the recurrence of conflict" (*S/2010/167, annex*) and that the Security Council should "conduct a comprehensive policy review on an effective peacebuilding strategy" (*ibid., para. 1*).

On 16 June 2005, this Council wound up its seven-year mandate to oversee the resolution of the 10-year bloody civil conflict that had raged on the island of Bougainville in Papua New Guinea. Sadly and, indeed horribly, it is estimated that between 10,000 and 15,000 people — and maybe more — including women and children and touching all Papua New Guineans, lost their lives in what could have been an avoidable national tragedy.

A few months prior to the end of the mandate, between 20 May and 9 June 2005, the first general elections for President and members of the House of Representatives were successfully completed, resulting in the establishment of the Autonomous Bougainville Government. That historic election was made possible under the agreed constitutional arrangements between the Government of Papua New Guinea and the leaders of Bougainville — a process that was critical to securing the lasting peace that continues to prevail today.

Contextually, the amending of our national Constitution was a testament to the notion that, ultimately, any peace process has to be nationally owned and driven. That a nation saw fit to amend its supreme law to facilitate a peace process remains a key factor in how the Bougainville peace process has been sustained. I am also pleased to report that the second general elections are currently under way, with the results to be finalized in June.

The United Nations, through the Security Council and its agencies, especially the Department of Political Affairs, the United Nations Development Programme and UNICEF, played pivotal roles in ensuring the continuing success of the peacebuilding process. Our neighbouring countries in the Pacific region — namely, Australia, New Zealand, Fiji, Tonga and your own country, Mr. President, Japan — along with our regional agencies also participated in that process, at different levels and in different ways, thereby contributing to the continuing success of the peacebuilding process. This strongly underlines the view — and it is also our view — that any successful peace process must always have a strong element of partnership.

In our view, along with the idea of partnerships, there is a need for stronger application of the provisions of Article 52 of the Charter, whose paragraph 1 provides for

> "regional arrangements ... for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations".

Paragraph 3 of the same Article also states that the Security Council should "encourage the development of pacific settlement of ... disputes through such regional arrangements". We would make the observation that, of course, article 52 does not impair the provisions of Articles 34 and 35 of the Charter.

Your delegation's reference in its concept paper, Mr. President, to the need to ensure social stability along with political stability is critical, important and timely. There can be no peace unless there is peace among the population. The need to reinforce civilian capacities is therefore critical. Added to that is the need to empower women and, especially, youth. In the case of the latter, reintegration issues are critical if long-term peace is to be sustained. A peace dividend can only be realized if there is a concerted effort on the part of all parties concerned.

In conclusion, the Bougainville conflict, its resolution and the current peacebuilding process do not loom large in the global context. However, we believe that the United Nations and the Security Council should, in their attempt to review their comprehensive policy on an effective peacebuilding strategy, look to the Bougainville peace process in order to understand some of the dynamics that continue to contribute to the continuing success of that process.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Armenia.

Mr. Nazarian (Armenia): Thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this essential debate on peacebuilding-related issues. We also wish join previous speakers in thanking you, Sir, in your capacity as former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), for your active involvement in addressing this important subject. We greatly value the presence of the Foreign Minister of Japan and other Ministers here today. We strongly support their statements.

Armenia aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of the European Union. However, we would like to make some remarks in our national capacity.

The frequency with which the Security Council addresses post-conflict peacebuilding signifies the importance that the international community attaches to that issue as a preventive tool against the recurrence of conflict through the establishment of sustained security and stability, which are prerequisites for the maintenance of peace and development. It is also an acknowledgement of the Council's responsibility to fulfil the commitments undertaken to support countries that have emerged from conflict.

We share the views expressed by Council members and other speakers calling for more systematic attention to post-conflict peacebuilding, which we believe should be frequently reflected in the deliberations of the Security Council. We also believe that increased cooperation and the distribution of roles among the United Nations, the Bretton Woods institutions and regional organizations are essential.

Armenia remains committed to post-conflict peace initiatives and believes that the Security Council should further strengthen the rule of law and advance development initiatives by supporting peacebuilding mechanisms, such as the PBC, that help countries emerging from conflict in their recovery, reintegration and reconstruction efforts aimed at creating the foundations for sustainable peace and development. In that respect, it is important that the programmes adopted be country-specific, needs-based and target-oriented to ensure continued support from the people affected and to safeguard their success.

It is noteworthy that the PBC has shouldered for United Nations peacekeeping the important task of defining post-conflict strategies. We are encouraged that previous reports indicate that it has achieved certain satisfactory results in some countries.

Conflicts in the South Caucasus have defied peaceful accommodation, let alone resolution, for more than two decades. Wars have been fought, people displaced, law and order disrupted and economies shattered and paralysed. Yet, we have not fully employed an essential resource that could bring us

closer to peace: sustainable economic development. That could create regional opportunities for trade, investment and jobs and lead to engagement and solutions on the political front.

One might question the value of embarking on such an effort in post-conflict situations where negotiations among the parties are ongoing. However, international experience shows that economic cooperation and interaction can be a valuable confidence-building measure that often leads to political cohesion. Examples can be found in Western and Eastern Europe and, increasingly, in Asia.

With a view to achieving greater coherence in the region and expanding the geographical area for cooperation, the South Caucasus needs various regional initiatives and programmes sponsored by donor countries and organizations to be implemented. In addition, international financial institutions and private-sector contributions should play a decisive role in moving towards that end.

The region desperately awaits leadership from the global investment community. The ultimate task here is to translate that vision into working realities that emphasize the future instead of focusing on the painful past. The post-conflict period in the region provides a window of opportunity for providing basic security, delivering peace dividends, building confidence in the political process and strengthening core national ownership to lead peacebuilding efforts and lay the foundations for sustainable development.

The successful implementation of that agenda requires a basic level of political will and determination on the part of national and regional actors as preconditions for peacebuilding. With those political conditions in place, the ability of the United Nations or any other organization or intergovernmental or regional actor will be enhanced and supported. Armenia therefore welcomes the Japanese initiative to hold this open debate. This is an opportunity to recap and reflect on our past experiences in dealing with the issue of post-conflict peacebuilding and to highlight priority aspects for united practical actions.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Nepal.

Mr. Acharya (Nepal): I wish to begin by thanking you, Mr. President, for organizing this open debate on the important issue of post-conflict peacebuilding.

My delegation associates itself with the statement just made by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Post-conflict peacebuilding efforts and their architecture are works in progress at the United Nations. Peacebuilding is a multidimensional approach to preventing war-torn countries from relapsing into a cycle of conflict. It has the important role of interposing itself amid security and normal development activities by nurturing an environment conducive to moving them onto the path of sustainable security, peace and socio-economic transformation. It therefore naturally encompasses diplomatic, security and economic efforts. We must not lose sight of that fundamental reality.

There is no doubt that security and development reinforce each other. There has to be a delicate balance between the two, so as to effectively lead a country towards the post-conflict phase. To achieve and sustain that, we should promote a coherent approach right from the beginning, with a view to ensuring national ownership of the whole process, by building capacity, dealing with immediate security challenges and promoting stabilizing activities through quick delivery of services and substantially ramped up development efforts.

We are all aware of the fragility of the transitional situation. Hence, the restoration of a modicum of security should immediately be followed by the simultaneous promotion of the political process, the consolidation of security and the effective promotion of employment-generating economic activities in order to instil hope in the minds of people. No other measure can surpass the positive effect of the early distribution of a peace dividend to the general public in generating hope and confidence for reconstruction and recovery. Very often, the cause of conflict has to do with deprivation. Therefore, ensuring effective and quick development works even in a minimum environment of security would be a great positive multiplier. This is where the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) should create a strong niche for itself.

The PBC has been envisaged as a specialized and nodal intergovernmental advisory body focusing on marshalling resources, raising the international profiles

of the countries on its agenda and coordinating peacebuilding activities there. It has now has been accepted as an important instrument in promoting peace and stability in some of countries emerging from conflict. However, it has yet to fully consolidate its work in the field or to make a strong mark on the ground. Better and robust coordination, coherence and collaboration on the field and at the regional and international levels would greatly enhance its effectiveness.

As peacebuilding is not a linear process, incorporating and coordinating peacebuilding activities from the early phase of peacekeeping greatly enhances its work. Similarly, the availability of substantial resources for peacebuilding, the effective and quick delivery of resources on the ground, and the further strengthening of the Peacebuilding Support Office would help better to consolidate peacebuilding efforts. In this context, my delegation is confident that the 2010 PBC review process will come up with concrete suggestions to make the PBC more effective and efficient in the days ahead. As a member of the Organizational Committee of the PBC, Nepal will make efforts towards that end.

Even though the peacebuilding environment varies from country to country, we see many commonalities in the approaches to and building blocks of peacebuilding. The accumulation of key components of effective peacebuilding would help to concentrate our focus on critical components of the peace process.

The time has come to consolidate our collective efforts and institutional settings to deal with the challenges of peacebuilding by promoting security, rehabilitation and recovery simultaneously with the substantial utilization of resources and our political capital. The United Nations has to nurture the hope and dreams of peace and economic prosperity of the millions of war-torn society. As has been stated often, if the international community, led by the United Nations system, responds rapidly, coherently and effectively, there is a greater chance of sustaining peace and laying the foundations for sustainable development. This could not be more true in the case of peacebuilding than in any other endeavour.

The President: Following consultations among the members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council recalls the statements of its President (S/PRST/2010/2, S/PRST/2009/23, S/PRST/2008/16) and emphasizes the critical importance of post-conflict peacebuilding as the foundation for building sustainable peace and development in the aftermath of conflict. The Council highlights the need for effective peacebuilding strategies to ensure durable peace and development.

"The Security Council recognizes that sustainable peacebuilding requires an integrated approach, which strengthens coherence between political, security, development, human rights and rule of law activities. The Council recognizes the important role that the United Nations can play in supporting national authorities to develop peacebuilding strategies that incrementally and comprehensively address priority needs. The Council encourages international partners to align their support behind these strategies at the international, regional, national and local levels.

"The Security Council reaffirms the importance of national ownership and the development of national capacity, and underscores that peacebuilding strategies should be considered in a country-specific context. In this regard, the Council recognizes the need for national authorities to take responsibility as soon as possible for reconstituting the institutions and functions of Government, with a view to addressing all key peacebuilding needs. The Council emphasizes that support for democratic, transparent and accountable governance is essential in order to achieve durable peace.

"The Security Council highlights the importance of the peaceful settlement of political disputes in a post-conflict State and addressing the sources of violent conflict as essential elements for achieving sustainable peace. The Council recognizes the importance of advancing the peace process and peaceful coexistence through inclusive dialogue, reconciliation and reintegration. The Council reaffirms that ending impunity is essential if a society recovering from conflict is to come to terms with past abuses committed against civilians affected by armed

conflict and to prevent such future abuses. The Council underlines the importance of holding free, fair and transparent elections for sustainable peace.

"The Security Council recognizes security sector reform as essential to the peacebuilding process and affirms that security sector reform should be nationally owned. Effective security sector reform requires developing a professional, effective and accountable security sector, in particular national police and military capacities under the civilian oversight of a democratic Government. The Council highlights the importance of a sector-wide approach for security sector reform, which enhances the rule of law, including through the establishment of an independent justice and correction systems. The Council requests the Secretary-General to include, where appropriate and mandated, in his reports on specific missions an indication of their progress in supporting national authorities towards achieving coordinated and comprehensive international support to nationally owned security sector reform programmes.

"The Security Council recognizes the importance of pursuing political stability and security, alongside socio-economic development, for the consolidation of peace. The Council stresses the importance of delivering early peace dividends, including the provision of basic services, in order to help instil confidence and commitment to the peace process. The Council recognizes that the reintegration of refugees, internally displaced persons and former combatants, in coordination with security sector reform and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, should not be seen in isolation, but should be carried out in the context of a broader search for peace, stability and development, with special emphasis on the revival of economic activities. The Council notes, in this regard, that high levels of youth unemployment can be a major challenge to sustainable peacebuilding.

"While recognizing the importance of developing State capacity, the Security Council also emphasizes the importance of increased attention and coherent policies to the reconstruction of conflict-affected communities and empowerment of affected people, in particular vulnerable civilians, such as children, the elderly, refugees and internally displaced persons. The Council takes note of the need for assistance for victims. The Council, in accordance with its resolutions 1325 (2000) and 1820 (2008), underlines the key role women and young persons can play in re-establishing the fabric of society, and stresses the need for their involvement in the development and implementation of post-conflict strategies in order to take account of their perspectives and needs.

"The Security Council notes that drug-trafficking, organized crime, terrorism, illegal trafficking in arms and trafficking in people could constitute transnational threats with an impact on the consolidation of peace in countries emerging from conflict, and underlines the importance of increasing international and regional cooperation on the basis of common and shared responsibility to address them effectively.

"The Security Council reiterates the importance of launching peacebuilding assistance at the earliest possible stage. The Security Council recognizes the critical role of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in addressing peacebuilding priorities, particularly through marshalling support and resources and improving planning and coordination for peacebuilding efforts. The Council further recognizes the need for greater coordination with the Commission and looks forward to the 2010 review of the PBC and the recommendations on how its role can be enhanced.

"The Security Council recognizes the importance of enhancing coordination among relevant bilateral and multilateral donors to ensure predictable, coherent and timely financial support for post-conflict peacebuilding. The Council underscores that funding mechanisms for addressing immediate post-conflict needs, in particular the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), should play a catalytic role, which should be followed by more substantial, longer-term finance as soon as possible for the recovery and reconstruction efforts. The Council encourages greater synergy between the PBF and the PBC.

"The Security Council recognizes the need to broaden and deepen the pool of civilian experts, in particular from developing countries and women, to help develop national capacity, and encourages Member States, the United Nations and other relevant partners to strengthen cooperation and coordination in building such capacities. The Council looks forward to the recommendations of the United Nations civilian capacity review in the Secretary-General's follow-up report of his report (S/2009/304).

"The Security Council emphasizes the need for the United Nations system to strengthen strategic partnerships with other international, regional and subregional organizations, as well as financial institutions, in particular by promoting coherence and coordination among their plans and programmes. In this connection, the Council looks forward to further strengthening of the cooperation between the United Nations and the World Bank at both the Headquarters and field levels, and for the Secretary-General to include in the same follow-up report details of what steps have been made in generating more timely, predictable and accountable responses for the key peacebuilding sectors as requested."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2010/7.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.